# NOTICE

JPRS will soon begin publication of a new report in the Worldwide series: ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES. The report will compile open-source material from all parts of the world on a wide range of environmental topics, ranging from localized pollution problems to global ecological concerns, in all their political dimensions.

Current DAILY REPORTs and JPRS publications are listed in *Government Reports Announcements* issued semimonthly by the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), 5285 Port Royal Road, Springfield, Virginia 22161 and the *Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications* issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

The public may subscribe to either hardcover or microfiche versions of the DAILY REPORTs and JPRS publications through NTIS at the above address or by calling (703) 487-4630. Subscription rates will be provided by NTIS upon request. Subscriptions are available outside the United States from NTIS or appointed foreign dealers. New subscribers should expect a 30-day delay in receipt of the first issue.

U.S. Government offices may obtain subscriptions to the DAILY REPORTs or JPRS publications (hardcover or microfiche) at no charge through their sponsoring organizations. For additional information or assistance, call FBIS, (202) 338-6735, or write to P.O. Box 2604, Washington, D.C. 20013. Department of Defense consumers are required to submit requests through appropriate command validation channels to DIA, RTS-2C, Washington, D.C. 20301. (Telephone: (202) 373-3771, Autovon: 243-3771.)

# Daily Report

# Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-073
Monday
16 April 1990

# Daily Report
## Soviet Union

*FBIS-SOV-90-073* *16 April 1990*

CONTENTS

**NOTICE TO READERS:** An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.


**ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT**

Chernov Cited on Progress at Arms Talks *[TASS]* ..... 1
U.S. Arms Control Chief Discusses START *[TASS]* ..... 1
Grinevskiy Views GDR Proposal at Vienna *[TASS]* ..... 1

**WORLDWIDE ISSUES**

Gremitskikh 13 Apr Briefing on World Issues ..... 3
Disarmament in Middle East *[TASS]* ..... 3
India-Pakistan Tension *[TASS]* ..... 3
Italian Foreign Minister's Visit *[TASS]* ..... 3
TASS Summary ..... 4
President Bush, Thatcher Discuss NATO, Summit *[TASS]* ..... 4
Shevardnadze Interviewed on Technology Cooperation *[IZVESTIYA 14 Apr]* ..... 4
Foreign Reaction to Lithuanian Moves Noted *[PRAVDA 6 Apr]* ..... 6

**INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS**

**United States & Canada**

U.S. Senators Wind Up Visit to Soviet Union ..... 8
Make Statements on Arrival *[IZVESTIYA 12 Apr]* ..... 8
Primakov Receives Delegation *[Moscow TV]* ..... 8
Senators Depart Moscow *[TASS]* ..... 8
Pressure on Bush's Lithuania Stance Viewed *[PRAVDA 15 Apr]* ..... 8
Roundtable Views U.S. Attitude on Lithuania *[Moscow Radio]* ..... 10
Zorin Comments on Upcoming Summit With U.S. *[Moscow International]* ..... 11
Kornilov Stresses Arms Cuts for Summit Agenda *[Moscow Radio]* ..... 11
Dubinin, U.S.'s Hills on Trade Contacts *[TASS]* ..... 13
U.S. Congress Refusal of UN Debts Funds Reported *[IZVESTIYA 10 Apr]* ..... 14
Daily Views Bush-Thatcher Talks in Bermuda *[IZVESTIYA 15 Apr]* ..... 14

**China**

PRC Premier Li Peng To Visit Moscow 23-26 Apr *[TASS]* ..... 15
Improving Sino-Soviet Ties Outlined, Praised *[TASS]* ..... 15
Reportage on Visit by PRC General Song Wenzhong ..... 16
Visit Concludes 12 Apr *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 14 Apr]* ..... 16
Song Wenzhong Assesses Talks *[TASS]* ..... 16
Riot Reported Near Soviet Border in Xinjiang *[Moscow International]* ..... 17

**Northeast Asia**

New USSR-ROK Air Routes Promote Relations *[Moscow International]* ..... 17
Korean-Language Newspapers in Sakhalin Reviewed *[Moscow International]* ..... 18
DPRK Paper Cited on Workers' Education *[IZVESTIYA 5 Apr]* ..... 19
Shevardnadze Comments on Kuriles, Sakhalin *[TASS]* ..... 19
U.S. General's Remarks on Japan Cause Protest *[IZVESTIYA 15 Apr]* ..... 19
MPRP Congress Ends; Plenum Begins Work *[TASS]* ..... 20
Chairman, Presidium Elected *[TASS]* ..... 20

Gorbachev Congratulates Mongolia's Ochirbat *[TASS]* ..... 20
Investigative Commission Set Up in Mongolia *[TASS]* ..... 20

### Near East & South Asia

TASS Issues New Report on Aeroflot Attack ..... 20
Saddam Husayn's 'Provocative Declarations' Viewed *[Radio Peace and Progress]* ..... 20
Comparison to Iranian Hostage Policy *[Moscow International]* ..... 21

### East Europe

Polish President Concludes USSR Visit, Departs ..... 21
Jaruzelski Notes 'Necessary' Visit *[Warsaw Radio]* ..... 21
Discovery of Katyn Papers Noted *[TASS]* ..... 22
Jaruzelski Receives NKVD Lists *[PRAVDA 14 Apr]* ..... 22
Gorbachev, Jaruzelski Talks Reported *[PRAVDA 16 Apr]* ..... 22
Lukyanov Meets With Jaruzelski *[TASS]* ..... 24
Gorbachev Gives Dinner Speech *[PRAVDA 14 Apr]* ..... 24
Jaruzelski Delivers Dinner Speech *[PRAVDA 14 Apr]* ..... 26
Jaruzelski Arrives in Katyn *[Warsaw PAP]* ..... 27
PRAVDA on Jaruzelski's Katyn Visit *[16 Apr]* ..... 28
Jaruzelski Visits Belorussia *[TASS]* ..... 28
Jaruzelski Ends Official Visit *[TASS]* ..... 28
Lukyanov Sees Off Jaruzelski *[TASS]* ..... 28
Jaruzelski Returns Home From USSR *[TASS]* ..... 29
TASS Cites Poland's Jaruzelski Upon Return ..... 29
Text of Soviet-Polish Declaration Published *[TASS]* ..... 29
Commentary Views Katyn Events, Documents *[Moscow TV]* ..... 30
FRG President Discusses German Reunification *[TASS]* ..... 30
Ryzhkov Congratulates GDR's De Maiziere *[IZVESTIYA 15 Apr]* ..... 30
MSZP Leader Interviewed on Opposition Role *[IZVESTIYA 12 Apr]* ..... 31
Anticommunist Right Wing in Romania Criticized *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 10 Apr]* ..... 32
Slovak Leader on Problems Facing Communist Party *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 8 Apr]* ..... 34

### West Europe

Cypriot Government on Airport Security Measures *[TASS]* ..... 35
USSR To Boost Petroleum Exports to Turkey *[Ankara ANATOLIA]* ..... 35
'Top Priority' Program on Germany Issue *[Moscow International]* ..... 36
Pope John Paul Receives Zagladin *[TASS]* ..... 39

## NATIONAL AFFAIRS

### Supreme Soviet Session

Tax, Media, Pension Laws on 16 April Agenda *[Moscow Radio]* ..... 40
Taxation Bill Debated *[TASS]* ..... 40
Supreme Soviet Committee Discusses KGB Law *[Moscow Radio]* ..... 40
Zelinskiy Interviewed on Law *[Moscow Radio]* ..... 41
Commissions Discuss Market Economy Transition *[Moscow Radio]* ..... 42

### Political & Social

Gorbachev Chairs Federation, Presidential Council *[TASS]* ..... 42
Economic Reform Discussed *[Moscow Radio]* ..... 42
Gorbachev Nominated as Candidate Congress Delegate *[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 13 Apr]* ..... 43
Further Reportage on 21st Komsomol Congress ..... 43
Report on Second Day *[Moscow TV]* ..... 43
Most Youths 'Not Interested' *[TASS]* ..... 45
Ligachev, Others Attend *[Moscow TV]* ..... 45
Ligachev Says Party Split 'Already Happening' *[Moscow TV]* ..... 45

PRAVDA Urges Precongress 'Shakeout' *[16 Apr]* ..... 46
'Marxist Platform' Organizes; Holds Conference *[Moscow TV]* ..... 48
Platform Explained *[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY No 14]* ..... 49
To Eliminate 'Hired Labor' *[Moscow TV]* ..... 50
Platform Members Interviewed *[Moscow Radio]* ..... 50
Shevardnadze Interviewed on 'View' Program *[Moscow TV]* ..... 51
Press Attache on Government, TASS Statements *[Moscow TV]* ..... 54
Biographic Notes on Presidential Council Members *[IZVESTIYA 29 Mar]* ..... 54
Economist Says Communist Party Split 'Inevitable' *[BBC TV]* ..... 58
Officers Assembly Backs Soyuz Deputies' Stance *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 5 Apr]* ..... 58
Biryukova Expounds on Drug Problems *[Moscow Radio]* ..... 59
Freedom of Conscience Bill Examined *[PRAVDA 12 Apr]* ..... 60
Christian Democratic Movement Founded *[TASS]* ..... 60
Peace Committee Holds Moscow Roundtable *[Moscow Radio]* ..... 60
Former POW Returns Home 13 Apr *[TASS]* ..... 61
Case for 'Party of Order' Questioned *[IZVESTIYA 11 Apr]* ..... 61
Coal Representatives Respond to Congress Walkout *[IZVESTIYA 9 Apr]* ..... 63
Draft Amendments to Cooperative Law Submitted *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 8 Apr]* ..... 64
Survey of Informal Groups Published *[MOSCOW NEWS No 7]* ..... 65
Past Psychiatric Abuses Examined *[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY No 14]* ..... 68
Buryat Official Views Party February Plenum *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 28 Mar]* ..... 69

**Economic**

Bunich Says Reform To Affect State Bureaucracy *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 13 Apr]* ..... 71
Abalkin Sees Need To Advance Reforms *[PRAVITELSTVENNYY VESTNIK No 13]* ..... 71
Comparison of Report on Industrial Decline *[IZVESTIYA 7 Apr]* ..... 76

**Agricultural**

Peasants, Equipment Not Ready for Spring *[IZVESTIYA 6 Apr]* ..... 76
Agricultural Developments for 15-21 March *[Moscow Radio]* ..... 77

**Scientific**

'Cosmos-2072' Satellite Launched 13 April *[TASS]* ..... 78
'Foton' Satellite Parameters Reported *[PRAVDA 13 Apr]* ..... 78
Cosmonautics Day Celebrated 12 Apr *[Moscow TV]* ..... 78
Mars Mission Financial Difficulties Described *[TASS]* ..... 79

## REGIONAL AFFAIRS

**Baltic Republics**

Lithuanian Moscow Representative Updates Situation *[Vilnius Radio]* ..... 80
Lithuanian Leadership Meets on Response to Moscow *[AFP]* ..... 80
Lithuanian Foreign Ministry Issues Statement *[Vilnius International]* ..... 81
Gorbachev Remarks About Lithuania, Party Split *[Moscow International]* ..... 81
Landsbergis Rejects Cancellation of Independence *[TASS]* ..... 81
Landsbergis Comments on Blockade Threat *[Moscow TV]* ..... 82
Landsbergis Says Sanctions Might Be 'Useful' *[Vilnius International]* ..... 82
Landsbergis Interviewed on Current Conflict *[Vienna KURIER 15 Apr]* ..... 82
Prunskiene Responds to Gorbachev Warning *[TASS]* ..... 83
Further on Reply *[Vilnius International]* ..... 83
Ozolas Views Gorbachev 'Ultimatum' *[Vilnius International]* ..... 83
Lithuanian Official on Moscow Ultimatum *[Vilnius International]* ..... 83
Lithuanians Stress Negotiations With Moscow *[Vilnius International]* ..... 84
Lithuanian Reaction to Gorbachev Reported *[Moscow TV]* ..... 84
Lithuanian Enactments 'Barrier to Talks' *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 13 Apr]* ..... 84
Dobychin Interviewed on Work of Party Plenum *[Moscow Radio]* ..... 86
Lithuanian Party Central Committee Holds Plenum *[TASS]* ..... 86

Prunskiene Addresses 11 Apr Supreme Council *[Vilnius Radio]* ..... 86
Prunskiene Views Baltic Cooperation Accord *[Vilnius Radio]* ..... 87
More on Economic Cooperation *[Vilnius International]* ..... 88
Lithuanian Dissatisfaction With Sajudis Cited *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 5 Apr]* ..... 88
New Lithuanian Sajudis 'Rules' Published *[Vilnius International]* ..... 89
Commentary on Lithuanian Impact on Western Ties *[Moscow International]* ..... 89
Daily Warns Lithuania of Economic Problems *[TASS]* ..... 90
Lithuanian Deputies Meet U.S. Senators *[Vilnius Radio]* ..... 90
'Absurd' Theory Behind Soviet Policies Noted *[Vilnius International]* ..... 90
Lithuanian Territorial Claims Viewed *[PRAVDA 22 Mar]* ..... 90
Lithuanian Soldier Urges Against Desertion *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 4 Apr]* ..... 92
Defense Ministry on Baltic 'Anti-Army' Acts *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 29 Mar]* ..... 93
Shved Addresses Vilnius Press Conference *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 12 Apr]* ..... 93
Voronezh Communists Appeal to Lithuanians *[PRAVDA 5 Apr]* ..... 94
Afanasyev, Marashev Write on Vilnius Visit *[Vilnius Radio]* ..... 94
Brazauskas Interviewed on Baltic Role *[Vilnius Radio]* ..... 95
Women's Delegation Recounts Meetings in Moscow *[Vilnius Radio]* ..... 96
Hunting Gun Ammunition Seized in Klaipeda *[TASS]* ..... 97
'Mayak' Official on Broadcasts in Lithuanian *[Vilnius International]* ..... 97
Landsbergis on Initial Lithuanian Crisis *[MOSCOW NEWS No 12]* ..... 97
Landsbergis Interviewed on Moscow's Stance *[Copenhagen BERLINGSKE TIDENDE 21 Mar]* ... 99
Baltic Komsomol Leaders in Press Conference *[TASS]* ..... 100
Revival of Estonian 'Paramilitary Structures' *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 12 Apr]* ..... 101
More on 'Rebirth' *[PAEVALEHT 22 Mar]* ..... 101
Estonian Defense League on People's Protection *[Estonian TV]* ..... 102
People's Front Adopts Appeal on Lithuania *[Tallinn Radio]* ..... 102
Estonia Adopts Military Service Law *[Moscow International]* ..... 102
Deputies Vote Against Law *[TASS]* ..... 102
Estonian People's Front Prepares for Congress *[Tallinn Radio]* ..... 103
New Estonian Government Starts Work *[TASS]* ..... 104
Estonian Government Holds First Meetings *[Tallinn Radio]* ..... 104
Estonian Communists To Remain Part of CPSU *[TASS]* ..... 104
Committee for Soviet Power Meets Press *[SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA 3 Mar]* ..... 105
Party of Estonian Entrepreneurs Formed *[SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA 4 Mar]* ..... 105
Breakaway Latvian Communists Meet 14 Apr *[TASS]* ..... 106
Riga Radio on Independent LCP Congress ..... 107
Commissions, Agenda Approved ..... 107
Lithuanian Support Proclaimed ..... 107
Relations With CPSU Discussed ..... 108
Kezbers Elected Chairman ..... 108
Independent Communist Party Program Noted *[TASS]* ..... 109
Latvian Doctors Refuse Reserve Service *[Riga International]* ..... 109
Union Support Group Set Up in Latvia *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 14 Apr]* ..... 109
Latvian Communist Party Shuts Down Newspaper *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 7 Apr]* ..... 110

**RSFSR**

RSFSR 'Democratic Russia' Holds Conference *[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY No 14]* ..... 110
Yeltsin Nominated Chairman *[Moscow Radio]* ..... 111
Four Candidates Nominated *[TASS]* ..... 111
Deputies Interviewed *[Moscow Radio]* ..... 112
First Round of RSFSR Elections Assessed *[IZVESTIYA 14 Mar]* ..... 113
Russian Republican People's Party Established *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 12 Apr]* ..... 114
Moscow Soviet Mayoral Elections Previewed *[TASS]* ..... 114
Moscow Oblast Soviet Deputies Meet 10 Apr *[Moscow Radio]* ..... 114
Leningrad Oblast Elects Supsov Leaders *[Moscow Radio]* ..... 114
Smolensk Oblast Soviet Chairman Elected *[Moscow Radio]* ..... 115
Vologda Obkom first Secretary Released *[Moscow Radio]* ..... 115
New Tatar Supreme Soviet Chairman Elected *[Moscow Radio]* ..... 115
Saykin Appointed RSFSR Deputy Premier *[TASS]* ..... 115
Komi ASSR Sets Up Trade Union Federation *[Moscow Radio]* ..... 115

Udmurt ASSR Supreme Soviet Session Held ..... 115
Opposition Group Emerges *[Moscow Radio]* ..... 115
Supreme Soviet Chairman Elected *[Moscow Radio]* ..... 116
Russian Christian Democrat Explains Positions *[TASS]* ..... 116
Leningrad Procuracy Brings Charges on TV Case *[Moscow Radio]* ..... 116
Moscow Paper Becomes Exclusive Party Organ *[TASS]* ..... 116
Transport Breakdown in Omsk Described *[Moscow Radio]* ..... 117
Yaroslavl Farmers Threaten Strike Action *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 10 Apr]* ..... 117

**Western Republics**

Chernobyl Telethon Committee Seeks World Aid *[TASS]* ..... 117
New Kiev Obkom Secretary Elected *[TASS]* ..... 118
Stryy City, Party Committees Combine *[Kiev International]* ..... 118
Zhitomir Electorate Supports Alternative Candidates *[LITERATURNAYA GAZETA No 11]* ... 118
Religious Differences in Western Ukraine Noted *[TASS]* ..... 119
'Serious Differences' at Crimean Tartar Talks *[Moscow International]* ..... 119
CP Secretariat on Moves Toward New Parties *[PRAVDA 24 Mar]* ..... 119
Rukh Leader Considers Quitting CPSU *[Kiev International]* ..... 120
Ukraine Demands Removal of CP Organizations *[TASS]* ..... 120
Ukraine Reactor Shut Down; No Contamination *[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 13 Apr]* ..... 121
Report on 2d-Round Elections in Belorussia *[TASS]* ..... 121
Lithuanian Belorussians Appeal to Authorities *[TASS]* ..... 121
Moldavian Election Results Summarized *[Kishinev Radio]* ..... 122
More on Election Results *[Moscow Radio]* ..... 122
CPSU Gains in Parliament *[TASS]* ..... 123
Moldavian Central Committee Holds Plenum *[TASS]* ..... 123
Moscow TV Reports on Plenum ..... 123
Kishinev Hunger Strikers Gain Officials' Attention *[IZVESTIYA 24 Mar]* ..... 124
Moldavia's Sociopolitical Situation 'Deteriorating' *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 31 Mar]* ..... 124
Situation in Kishinev Returning to 'Normal' *[Moscow International]* ..... 124

**Caucasus**

Reportage on Incident at Yerevan KGB Office ..... 125
KGB Official Describes Action *[Moscow Radio]* ..... 125
Armenian KGB Issues Statement *[Yerevan Radio]* ..... 125
TASS Report ..... 126
Fatality Reported *[TASS]* ..... 127
Emergency Declaration in Armenia Considered *[AFP]* ..... 128
5 Servicemen Released; Weapons Still Missing *[PRAVDA 14 Apr]* ..... 128
Railway Blockade of Armenia Causing 'Harm' *[Moscow Radio]* ..... 128
Details on Nairit Chemical Leak Reported *[Yerevan Radio]* ..... 129
Armenian KGB Chief Discusses Activities *[Yerevan KOMMUNIST 12 Mar]* ..... 129
Armenians Discuss Economic Autonomy Plan *[IZVESTIYA 22 Mar]* ..... 132
Armenian Party Commission Debates Draft Platform *[Yerevan Radio]* ..... 133
Razumovskiy Leaves Yerevan 6 Apr *[Yerevan Radio]* ..... 133
Armenian Foreign Minister Interviewed *[Amsterdam DE VOLKSKRANT 29 Mar]* ..... 133
New People's Association Formed in Azerbaijan *[Moscow International]* ..... 134
Georgian Komsomol Reportedly To Be Disbanded *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 27 Mar]* ..... 135

**Central Asia**

First Session of Kirghiz Supreme Soviet Held ..... 136
Constitution Issues Pondered *[TASS]* ..... 136
Various Laws Adopted *[TASS]* ..... 137
Tajik Supreme Soviet Elects Officials *[Dushanbe Radio]* ..... 137
New Uzbek Council of Ministers Listed *[PRAVDA VOSTOKA 31 Mar]* ..... 137
Uzbek Supreme Soviet Commission Chairmen Listed *[PRAVDA VOSTOKA 1 Apr]* ..... 138

## Chernov Cited on Progress at Arms Talks

*LD1304173190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1512 GMT 13 Apr 90*

[By Vladimir Chernyshev, TASS observer on military affairs]

[Text] Moscow, 13 Apr (TASS)—In recent days, a propaganda campaign has unfolded in the U.S. press concerning "Soviet intransigence" which allegedly has appeared at the talks on arms control. It is asserted that the Soviet Union has toughened its position on a number of fundamental matters at the talks. Attempts are being made to sow doubts concerning the resolve of the Soviet Union to adopt measures in order to achieve agreements in the near future at the talks in Geneva and Vienna. And the WASHINGTON POST, in an article by Roland Evans and Robert Novak, discusses in this connection—one knows not on what basis—the "growing influence of the Soviet military."

I asked General Nikolay Chervov, chief of adminstration of the General Staff of the USSR Armed Forces, to share his impressions about those publications. The opinion of the high-ranking military representative is that the massed assertions about a "toughening" of the Soviet position by certain U.S. mass media have nothing in common with the real state of affairs.

Talks on arms issues are not a game of give-away checkers, the general continued. One must take into account also the fact that the process of preparation for such most important agreements as the treaties on a 50-percent reduction in strategic offensive weapons and on conventional armed forces in Europe has reached the finishing straight. The most responsible stage in the talks has arrived. Painstaking study of all issues is necessary precisely now, so as to exclude situations in the future which could be used to attain unilateral advantages. In this context, a thorough analysis is required now as never before of the consequences of those variants proposed by the sides for solutions which are being examined to settle outstanding matters. Any other approach would undermine from the outset the vitality of the future agreement.

The USSR and the United States are two states upon which it is impossible to impose a policy not to their liking, espcially in disarmament, General Chervov went on to say. And this is entirely explicable, because the results of the talks are directly linked with the most sensitive national security interests, and with the provision of the required level of defense capacity of the country. It is natural that the states participating in the talks uphold such decisions as would not contradict their national interests.

The insinuations which are being spread in certain U.S. press organs and which distort the true attitude of the Soviet Union to the process of disarmament, only impede normal progress at the talks, especially at such a responsible moment when just over a month remains before the summit meeting, the general stressed. Restraint is required from both sides on the eve of that most important political event. One should not do anything which would hinder the achievements of agreements on a real reduction in the military potentials of the sides, he said.

## U.S. Arms Control Chief Discusses START

*LD1304170490 Moscow TASS in English 1646 GMT 13 Apr 90*

[Text] New York April 13 TASS—The U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency Director Ronald Lehman has said that the United States and the Soviet Union will be able to overcome differences over the draft START agreement before the next Soviet-American summit meeting.

In an interview with the ASSOCIATED PRESS News Agency on Thursday Lehman said that he could make no guarantees, but he thought the two sides would be able to solve all major problems before the summit meeting and conclude the START treaty before the end of 1990 or early in 1991.

Commenting on Lehman's statement, AP stresses that his assessment of prospects for a draft agreement is more optimistic than recent statements made by a number of U.S. representatives.

Most of the questions linked with drafting the START agreement have been agreed upon, the news agency said, referring to officials.

## Grinevskiy Views GDR Proposal at Vienna

*LD1304024990 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1236 GMT 12 Apr 90*

[Excerpts] Vienna, 12 Apr (TASS)—TASS correspondent Vladimir Smelov reports: The main object of a protocol on inspections to the treaty on conventional armed forces in Europe, which it is planned to sign at a meeting at summit level of the participant-states of the CSCE this year, is to ensure effective verification [kontrol] of compliance with the above-mentioned document and to guarantee that military arsenals will not be increased following the conclusion of the treaty. At the latest plenary session of the talks on conventional armed forces in Europe held in the Austrian capital today, Ambassador Klaus-Dieter Ernst, head of the GDR delegation, presented a draft of this protocol in the name of all the Warsaw Pact states. [passage omitted]

The draft, said special envoy O.A. Grinevskiy, head of the Soviet delegation in conversation with the TASS correspondent, is an important contribution to the emergence of the treaty that is being elaborated, significantly extending as it does the spheres of cooperation among the partners at the talks. It is well-considered and balanced, and has been drawn up with due consideration for the positions of the sides and the results of previous discussions and deliberations.

Touching on other current negotiation problems, the Soviet diplomat remarked that the question of means of eliminating the cut weapons is of important practical importance for all participant-states. He continued that we imagine that a number of such weapons could be put into a state of non-combat readiness and located at temporary depots under international inspection [kontrolem] until complete elimination. Together with this, it is necessary to also foresee the re-equipment of a certain number of the cut weapons for peaceful purposes. For instance, a number of tanks can be re-equipped successfully as cranes or tractors. It is understood that procedures should be worked out which would guarantee that equipment re-equipped in such a way cannot be again turned into a weapon. If general mutual understanding can be reached on this account, then we can agree on the first full document of our negotiations—a protocol on cuts and elimination.

At the same time, pointed out Grinevskiy, we cannot but note that recently a certain metallic tone has been heard in the speeches of certain Western partners and the negotiations. They definitely demonstrate that sometimes it is difficult to withstand the temptation to sharply simplify the situation, lighten one's negotiation tactic and leave the hard work of moving closer together. The Soviet delegation is ready for the most intense work and close cooperation with all participants in the negotiations in search of a solution to the remaining unresolved questions. It will apply all efforts to maintain a benevolent and constructive atmosphere at the forum, he emphasized.

## Gremitskikh 13 Apr Briefing on World Issues

### Disarmament in Middle East

*LD1304154790 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1359 GMT 13 Apr 90*

[Text] Moscow, 13 Apr (TASS)—Moncef el-May, a representative of the League of Arab States in the USSR, visited the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs on 11 April and handed over a statement adopted by the Council of Ambassadors of Arab countries in Moscow in connection with the whipping-up in Western countries and Israel of threats against Iraq. Yuriy Gremitskikh, first deputy head of the USSR Foreign Ministry Information Directorate, reported on this at a briefing today.

In a statement, Arab ambassadors noted the similarity of the present situation with Israel's attack on the Iraqi nuclear research center in 1981, and expressed apprehension that the purpose of the anti-Iraqi political campaign is a preparation for new aggression. It also notes that this uproar is helping Israel to strengthen the occupation of Arab lands and throttle the Palestinian intifadah, and is encouraging it to disrupt efforts for a just settlement of the conflict in the Middle East.

It was declared to the League of Arab Nations representative, said Yuriy Gremitskikh, that the Soviet Union expresses concern at the growing arms race in the Middle East, which threatens catastrophic consequences in the event of a new military explosion in this region. At the same time it is clear, he added, that a striving to lay responsibility for the situation that has arisen on Arab states contradicts the actual state of affairs and can produce an extremely negative effect.

The Soviet side considers that the task of ending the arms race in the Middle East as soon as possible and of limiting armaments there is becoming most urgent today, the representative of the USSR Foreign Ministry stressed. The Soviet Union has frequently expressed its opinion about the need to mobilize the efforts of all the states of the Middle East and the international community as a whole in order to set about freeing that region from nuclear, missile, chemical, and other types of mass annihilation weapons. Of course, this should be done in parallel with the unblocking of the Arab-Israeli conflict, in the general context of progress toward a just and all-embracing peace based on a balance of interest of all the sides.

The USSR notes with satisfaction the interest expressed by the Arab countries in creating a nuclear-free zone in the Middle East, Yuriy Gremitskikh continued. One cannot but welcome as well the readiness confirmed by Iraqi President Saddam Husayn to admit representatives of the International Atomic Energy Authority [IAEA] to conduct inspections at the Iraqi nuclear facility. "We also consider that Israel should adhere to the nuclear non-proliferation treaty and place its nuclear activity under IAEA guarantee," the Soviet diplomat added.

"We also call on all countries of the Middle East to work toward concluding as rapidly as possible a multilateral convention on banning and totally destroying chemical weapons without linking this with other problems of disarmament. Talks on this are not at such an advanced a stage as those on the convention to ban chemical weapons," the representative of the USSR Foreign Ministry said.

### India-Pakistan Tension

*LD1304163990 Moscow TASS in English 1540 GMT 13 Apr 90*

[Text] Moscow April 13 TASS—"Growing tension between India and Pakistan over Kashmir is the cause of the Soviet Union's concern and anxiety," Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Yuriy Gremitskikh said at a briefing today.

"The Soviet Government regrets the acts of violence and human losses," he said. "One hopes that the parties to the conflict will display sense, restraint, and prevent tension from escalating."

"The USSR is confident that an escalation of tension meets neither the interests of India nor Pakistan. Urgent and energetic efforts should be taken to relieve the conflict through a peaceful and political dialogue on the basis of the Simla Agreement," the spokesman said.

### Italian Foreign Minister's Visit

*LD1304181190 Moscow TASS in English 1738 GMT 13 Apr 90*

[Text] Moscow April 13 TASS—Italian Foreign Minister Gianni de Michelis will visit Moscow at the invitation of the Soviet Government from April 16 to 18, Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Yuriy Gremitskikh announced at a briefing here today. Before landing in Moscow, he will make a private trip to Leningrad.

The Italian foreign minister's visit will continue the fruitful Soviet-Italian political high-level dialogue. It will take place within the framework of an agreement to hold political consultations twice a year at the level of foreign ministers, Gremitskikh said.

The forthcoming talks in Moscow between Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and Gianni de Michelis will focus on the implementation of the Rome agreements reached during Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to Italy in November 1989. They will also discuss developments in Europe, the German question and stepping up the disarmament process in all principal directions.

"The USSR regards its relations with Italy, which plays an important part in European affairs, as an important factor iln deepening a constructive dialogue with West Europe in general," Gremitskikh stressed.

### TASS Summary

*LD1304170890 Moscow TASS in English 1624 GMT 13 Apr 90*

[Quotation marks as received]

[Text] Moscow April 13 TASS—A congratulatory message from Soviet Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov to Lothar de Maiziere, elected prime minister of the German Democratic Republic's new government, was read out by Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Yuriy Gremitskikh at a briefing today.

"The Soviet Union is ready for broad cooperation" with the new government of the German Democratic Republic in order "to maintain and develop friendly cooperation" between the two countries on the basis of equality, respect for sovereignty and mutual benefit. We will work to establish new security structures and consolidate peace and stability in Europe," the message says.

According to news agencies, de Maiziere allegedly told journalists that the united Germany will be a NATO member, since NATO will give up its present-day strategy and seek to establish an all-European system of security," the Soviet spokesman said.

"The Soviet side has repeatedly, including at the highest level, set forth its clear stand on that question," Gremitskikh said. "I should like to repeat a passage from Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze's article, printed in the May issue of the Journal '16 NATO Nations': 'Germany's NATO membership is unacceptable to the USSR. A compromise option needs to be found'."

"Italian Foreign Minister Gianni de Michelis will pay a working visit to Moscow from April 16 to 18 at the Soviet Government's invitation," Gremitskikh said.

"Relations with Italy, which plays an important role in the European continent's affairs, are instrumental in deepening the Soviet Union's constructive dialogue with West Europe as a whole," he said.

"Monsef el-Mai, a representative of the Arab League in the USSR, visited the Soviet Foreign Ministry on April 11. He handed over to the Soviet side a statement which was passed by the council of Arab ambassadors in Moscow because of rising threats against Iraq in western countries and Israel," Gremitskikh said.

The Arab League representative was told that the Soviet Union was concerned about the mounting arms race in the Middle East, which could be catastrophic, if a new military conflict breaks out in that area. Meanwhile, it is clear, he added, that the desire to hold Arab states' responsible for the state of affairs runs counter to reality, and may produce a negative effect.

The Soviet Union expresses concern and anxiety over heightened tension between India and Pakistan over Kashmir, the Soviet spokesman said.

"The USSR is confident that the escalation of tension is not in the interests of either India or Pakistan. Urgent and energetic efforts should be taken to relieve the situation through a peaceful, political dialogue on the basis of the Simla Agreement," he said.

### President Bush, Thatcher Discuss NATO, Summit

*LD1304211590 Moscow TASS in English 2057 GMT 13 Apr 90*

[Text] Washington April 14 TASS—U.S. President George Bush met with British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher in Hamilton, Bermuda, on Friday [13 April].

Their talks are part of a series of Bush's planned talks with NATO leaders within the framework of the U.S. president's preparations for a summit meeting with Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev.

Presidential Press Secretary Marlin Fitzwater pointed out that Bush wants to meet Gorbachev while knowing firmly the opinion of other members of the alliance.

During a flight to Bermuda Bush told reporters that he welcomed Gorbachev's statement to some democratic senators in Moscow on Thursday about the Soviet Union's determination to take all measures so that a treaty on a 50 per cent cut in strategic offensive arms could be initialled in June.

When meeting a group of U.S. senators, Gorbachev also said that the Soviet participants in negotiations were instructed to expedite the work. "We are sending the same signals to our negotiators and policy-makers," Bush said.

The president also expressed understanding for Gorbachev's objections to "lectures" from Washington about Lithuania. "I don't view that as a hostile comment but I view it as a reiteration of his well-known position," Bush said. "I can understand his position," he emphasised.

During the first two-hour meeting the U.S. President and the British prime minister discussed a "full range of international issues facing the North Atlantic Alliance," Fitzwater said. They focussed on German reunification, NATO, the status of talks on troop levels in Europe, Lithuania, Iraq's weapons and East-West trade, he said.

In preparation for the Soviet-U.S. summit talks, Bush already met with Canadian Prime Minister Brian Mulroney and will hold talks with French President Francois Mitterrand next week.

### Shevardnadze Interviewed on Technology Cooperation

*PM1404174590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 14 Apr 90 Morning Edition p 4*

[Unattributed "Interview with E.A. Shevardnadze"; date, place not given: "To Remove One More Wall"]

[Text] [IZVESTIYA] An international conference organized by the United Nations—"Trends in Science and Technology: The Consequences for International Peace and Security"—will be held in the Japanese city of Sendai 16-19 April. Will representatives of the Soviet Union participate in it? If so, what do we expect from this forum?

[Shevardnadze] I think it would be surprising if a Soviet delegation were not to participate in such an important and interesting measure.

The United Nations is doing a tremendous thing by holding such conferences. They save any country money and material resources and enable it to keep up with technical progress, to correct its system of education and of training scientific cadres, and to implement a more soundly based social policy.

Composite materials mean not just aircraft that are almost invisible on the radar screen. They entail a whole train of things that alter the structure of the economy. The significance of the traditional sectors of industry is falling. Aluminum, titanium, and other metals are being saved. The means of production are changing—it is not necessary to extract a large quantity of ore, and power consumption per unit of output is falling. Ecology and man are profiting as a result.

Is it not important to know by what means and at what price the world will satisfy its growing energy needs? By means of the sun, the wind, water, or biotechnology? Or will thermonuclear fusion work? Maybe superconductivity will help?

Such conferences make forecasts for the future. These are needed by politicians, developers of military hardware, civil engineers, construction workers, medics, communications workers, tailors, and dieticians.

They are needed in order to see what awaits us and where the "highway" of mankind will pass in the future.

And it is, of course, clear: Without such guidelines it is quite impossible to reliably and rationally ensure national security and to ensure peace for one's people without ruining it.

I will say more: No talks on limiting and reducing arms can be held today without knowing the development trends of military technology. We still do not always manage to reduce and eliminate in time what is old, and it is already necessary to proceed to elaborating measures to control the use of scientific and technical achievements for military purposes.

The conference to be held by the United Nations appears particularly topical precisely from this viewpoint. Our country, India, and certain other states have put to the United Nations a whole number of ideas aimed at preventing the use of new technologies to create weapons. I believe that the conference will promote the development of international cooperation in this direction.

Here its actual venue is of considerable importance. Japan has experienced the tragic consequences of the greatest military-technological advance of the epoch. On the other hand, it has been able to vigorously turn scientific and technical progress toward improving the quality of human life and has used it very effectively to ensure economic growth. Japan is a very convincing example of a power whose world status has been attained not so much thanks to the quantity and complexity of its weapons as thanks to its intellect and its ability to place this at the service of peaceful development.

[IZVESTIYA] You speak of the need to control military technologies. But how, in your view, is it possible to enhance their role in strengthening international security in its other, nonmilitary aspects—economic, political, humanitarian?

[Shevardnadze] The product of the human intellect is becoming one of the most attractive objects of world exchange. The "density" and "proportion" of high-technology output are growing in world economic ties and international economic structures. Trends toward the international division of labor on the one hand and toward integration on the other are strengthening. It is possible to say that a new world reality is taking shape—transnational scientific and technical potential.

But at the same time, unfortunately, there are growing discrepancies in the possession of it: Some countries have forged far ahead, while others remain on the periphery of scientific and technical progress. This imbalance is dangerous for peace. And now it must be a question not just of the strong helping the weak but of creating conditions in which opportunities can be equalized.

This is why the significance of international cooperation and of the coordination and mutual enrichment of various countries' scientific and technical efforts is increasing so much under modern conditions as important factors for the advancement of all states. This is particularly important in view of the new global challenges which our epoch is throwing down to mankind. It is simply impossible—even for the most developed countries—to resolve alone a whole number of problems of, for example, the search for alternative sources of energy, the improvement of the environment, and others.

Having realized this, we have adopted a policy of integrating our economy in the world economic system. We have a tremendous scientific and technical potential and great achievements in the peaceful exploration of space and in the sphere of the fundamental sciences. However, while we know how to make discoveries, we lag behind the West in our ability to turn the achievements of scientific and technical thought into vital benefits for society. This is one of the sad consequences of the long domination of administrative methods that fetter initiative and enterprise and of excessively rigid centralization in planning and management.

One of the tasks of perestroyka is to release the energy of science, give it scope, and create conditions for mutually enriching exchanges.

However, not everything here depends on us. The ice hummocks of the "cold war" still stand in the way of broad scientific and technical cooperation. People in some countries in the West still look at scientific exchanges chiefly through the prism of strong-arm stereotypes and the desire to ensure scientific and technical isolation in the military sphere, to play the military race again, and to exhaust economically.

The "Berlin wall," which divided the world along ideological lines, has collapsed, but there is still a wall of division and discrimination in the sphere of science and technology—Cocom [Coordinating Committee for Multilateral Export Controls].

What is needed in an age of global challenges is a global conversion of thinking and politics. And if in world affairs we all learn to understand and take account of each other's interests and concerns, then we should also work toward this in the practice of scientific and technical cooperation. If our partners have any fears that technological exchanges may be used for military purposes, we must seek opportunities to allay these fears. For example, instead of sheltering behind various proscriptive lists, we should seek solutions in areas of conflict, starting by revealing and specifying mutual concerns. We should endeavor to ensure confidence that scientific and technical exchanges will not be used for an illicit purpose. For we ourselves, who have invested a great deal in military science and technology, also do not want new developments to be used in one way or another against our security. It is time, in my view, to be concerned about a system and structures of scientific and technological trust.

The key to these is the open and verifiable nature of the use of scientific and technological cooperation. In fact, the first shoots of this thinking have already partly emerged in the nuclear sphere, for example. I will remind you that in the fifties the charter of the International Atomic Energy Agency was founded precisely on the principle of guarantees of the nonuse of cooperation in the nuclear sphere for military purposes. It would be possible to develop the concepts and the practice of creating open laboratories and broader joint studies and to think through the organization of on-site inspections relating to the use of transferred technologies.

[IZVESTIYA] In speaking of global challenges to mankind, you mentioned the problem of ecology. What, in your view, is the role of scientific and technical cooperation in this sphere?

[Shevardnadze] The technosphere created by scientific and technical thought poses threats to the biosphere. However, that same thought is capable of saving it. And insofar as the biosphere has no borders, it is necessary to make cross-border efforts and pool potentials, possibilities, resources, and ideas. A unified strategy is needed to combat ecological disaster.

The idea of a new "strategic initiative"—an ecological one—obviously merits attention. To gather within the framework of a single internationally based superproject the potential of mankind's best minds and concentratedly channel it into elaborating the most perfect and as yet unknown technological solutions for saving the planet from ecological disaster.

I have already expressed my opinion repeatedly that what is needed in the nature conservation sphere is a special regime for the exchange of technology which takes the maximum account both of general interests and of the specific needs of each state, depending on the ecological situation taking shape in it.

How can developing countries, for example, which are encountering such acute ecological problems as desertification, deforestation, soil exhaustion, and a shortage of fresh water, manage without technological innovations? All need new technologies, regardless of the degree of economic or scientific development.

The following thought arises in parallel: Why not create an international register of enterprises that pose a special danger to the environment? Each state would supply data for this register at its own discretion, but they would be evaluated by independent expert international opinion. With a view to eliminating the projects that are most dangerous to nature it would be possible to provide for credits to be allocated from an international fund for the retooling of such enterprises. The Soviet Union could name certain of its own enterprises for priority inclusion on such a register, open them up for inspections, and assign specialists to participate in an expert international appraisal.

Confidence-building measures, openness, and transparency are needed not only in the military sphere—now that the threat of ecological disaster is comparable with the nuclear threat we must consciously and purposefully reveal its potential seats to each other.

Addressing the conference hosts, I would like particularly to point to the Soviet Union's readiness to comprehensively develop ecological cooperation with Japan. In the interests of such cooperation we would be prepared to open up the Kuril islands and Sakhalin and turn them into a test bed for joint efforts in the nature conservation sphere.

And, of course, I sincerely wish the conference success.

## Foreign Reaction to Lithuanian Moves Noted

*PM1204134990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 Apr 90 Second Edition p 6*

[TASS roundup of reports from Washington, Brussels, Paris, and London: "On the Path of Realism"]

[Text] 5 Apr—Many foreign mass media reports concern the situation in the USSR's Baltic republics. Anxiety is being expressed in a host of material over the fact that the artificial exacerbation of tension might have a ruinous effect on the processes of perestroyka in the Soviet Union and undermine the stability which has been created in recent years on the European Continent with so much difficulty.

Washington—"The Lithuanian leadership has set off down the wrong road in trying to achieve the republic's instant secession from the USSR by proclaiming its independence and chosing the road of confrontation," is the opinion held by A. Perlmutter, a U.S. university professor of political sciences and sociology, who had an article published today in the conservative WASHINGTON TIMES. He expressed the conviction that in Lithuania's case independence "need not necessarily mean separation from the federation of autonomous Soviet republics whose formation is envisaged by the USSR president in the future." The new authorities in Vilnius, writes the academic, "were counting on international and especially U.S. support, but they did not wait for it," whereas the personal reaction of U.S. President G. Bush to the Lithuanian proclamation of independence "was restrained, considered, and correct from the standpoint of policy and realism."

At the same time, the U.S. press reports the resolution adopted yesterday by the U.S. Congress House of Representatives "in support of Lithuania's independence," which contains an appeal to the U.S. President "to plan and take such steps" in as short a time as possible which would allow "diplomatic relations between the United States and the new Lithuanian Government to be normalized."

Brussels—The statement of EEC foreign ministers published here expresses anxiety "over the potentially serious consequences" of the situation in Lithuania for improving the climate in Europe. The ministers urged the sides "to show maximum restraint" and to begin talks without delay.

Paris—French Minister of Foreign Affairs R. Dumas stated in the country's National Assembly that to France "the aspiration of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia to independence is obvious, and France interprets it positively." At the same time, he stressed, it is impossible to ignore 50 years of history and the fact that there are Russian, Polish, and German communities in Lithuania, and that various economic and administrative ties exist, which undoubtedly complicates the swiftest solution to the problem.

London—Lithuania "is in an excessive hurry," thinks J. Eberle, a well-known British political scientist. "Great Britain had a similar experience in the past with Rhodesia, which also decided the question of independence unilaterally," he said. "However, in the end this meant a delay in granting independence to Zimbabwe. Because of this I advocate that the Lithuanian people refrain from a unilateral expression of will." The political scientist specially stressed the importance of the fact that perestroyka in the USSR be crowned with success. This process must be concluded successfully, otherwise more serious problems might occur, the British expert thinks.

## United States & Canada

### U.S. Senators Wind Up Visit to Soviet Union

#### Make Statements on Arrival

*PM1504140390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 12 Apr 90 Morning Edition p 4*

[Report by P. Golub: "U.S. Senators in Moscow"]

[Text] A U.S. Senate delegation headed by Democratic majority leader George Mitchell, which is in our country at the invitation of the USSR Supreme Soviet, arrived in Moscow from Leningrad 11 April.

The delegation was greeted at the airport by Presidential Council Member Ye.M. Primakov, U.S. Ambassador to the USSR J. Matlock, and other officials.

In a brief statement at the airport G. Mitchell stressed that the relations that have taken shape in recent years between our countries at various levels are distinguished by constructiveness, warmth, and sincerity. The exchange of delegations, including parliamentary delegations, G. Mitchell stressed, permits a detailed and sincere discussion of the most diverse questions, and we hope that our present trip will contribute to the development of mutually beneficial contacts between the United States and the USSR.

Talking about the prospects for Soviet-American relations in the light of the upcoming visit to the United States by USSR President M.S. Gorbachev, the U.S. delegation head said that, like many other politicians, he is very optimistic that the meeting will succeed.

Answering your IZVESTIYA correspondent's question about the significance of and prospects for interparliamentary exchanges between the USSR and the United States, G. Mitchell noted that the maintenance of regular contacts between the two countries' legislators is an essential condition of the successful development of mutual understanding and contributes to strengthening our societies' democratic institutions.

In a brief conversation John Glenn, Democratic senator from Ohio and well-known astronaut, noted that, although the busy program for the visit to the USSR rules out detailed talks on opportunities for cooperation in the space exploration sphere, he hopes that in the very near future it will be possible to start a discussion of new joint projects for the peaceful study and exploration of outer space. "I am a staunch advocate of Soviet-American cooperation in the peaceful use of outer space," J. Glenn stressed.

#### Primakov Receives Delegation

*LD1304192290 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 13 Apr 90*

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[text] Today, Comrade Primakov, member of the Presidential Council, received a U.S. Senate delegation headed by Senator Mitchell. A discussion took place concerning the state of affairs in various spheres of Soviet-U.S. relations, and other international problems which attract mutual interest.

The members of the delegations noted that the issues connected with the formation of new bodies of state power and the transformations in the Soviet Union are evoking great interest in the United States. [video shows delegation sitting at a table]

#### Senators Depart Moscow

*LD1404072490 Moscow TASS in English 0714 GMT 14 Apr 90*

[Text] Moscow April 14 TASS—A delegation from the U.S. Senate, headed by George Mitchell, left Moscow today. It stayed in the Soviet Union on an official visit at the invitation of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

### Pressure on Bush's Lithuania Stance Viewed

*PM1404182590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Apr 90 First Edition p 7*

[Tomas Kolesnichenko, "View From Moscow": "Really Back to a Face-Off?"]

[Text] Someone pronounced these words, or I heard them... In any case, they hang in the air, as it were. I get the impression that a crafty "time machine" has unexpectedly taken us back in time. Political observers have once again started talking of "linkages" in Soviet-U.S. relations, which are familiar to us from the not so distant past, of "public pressure" on the White House, of a policy of force and threats, etc. Has the famous "wheel of history" really turned back, and is fate really once again inviting Moscow and Washington to a "face-off"?

#### External Aspect of the Problem

In reality everything is probably both simpler and more complex. Simpler because the "wheel" is turning as it should and, although the rhetoric has been toughened up to some extent, this still does not signify the return of the "Cold War." More complex because international relations—Soviet-U.S. relations above all—have come up against a new reality. And a great deal, including the world's stability and security, now depends on how both sides react to this "challenge of the time." I have in mind, of course, the "problem of Lithuania," which has torn into Soviet-U.S. relations like the Tunguska meteorite, threatening to cause tremendous damage to everything it encounters in its path.

I will begin with the fact that in reality the "problem of Lithuania" does not and cannot exist for the United States. It is an exclusively internal problem of the Soviet Union. A difficult problem, requiring the maximum display of political good will and tact, consideration, and observance of legality, constitutional norms, and human

rights. It is very important to record this viewpoint, since it reflects an unshakable principle of international law—noninterference in one another's internal affairs.

Revolutionary processes are now under way in our state. By developing glasnost and democracy while observing the constitution's norms, a search is on for ways to develop the federation. Right down to separation and secession from the union. However, attempts to change the existing situation by unconstitutional voluntarist means are inadmissible.

This problem is also of international significance, if only because outbursts of separatism and a desire to redraw the map of the country by illegal means may arise in other federative states too. And if we yield to U.S. pressure on the Lithuanian question, let us say, then in accordance with the "principle of precedence" Washington may wish to assume "moral responsibility" in the future too and play the role of some arbitrator—a role which no one is offering it. This is, of course, inadmissible, just as it would be unacceptable for us, let us say, to interfere in U.S. affairs if, for example, the state of Texas, which was taken from Mexico, or (still closer to us) Alaska were to proclaim its independence.

To be fair, I will note that President Bush and his immediate entourage have preferred common sense (until recently, at any rate) and are now, it may be said, even resisting pressure from the residents of Capitol Hill and from certain circles in the country. This is indicated, above all, by the very fact that the date of the upcoming Soviet-U.S. summit meeting has been announced. I would also point to the U.S. President's assessment of the results of the recent Washington meeting between E.A. Shevardnadze and J. Baker. Certain Kremlinologists and our Americanists hastened to evaluate it as "disappointing." "On the contrary," Bush said, "the Soviet minister's visit was very good..."

Explaining Bush's position as a whole, THE WASHINGTON POST points out: "President Bush, who is so often criticized for irresoluteness, is making a gamble—and a bold one—in backing Mikhail Gorbachev."

But let us not fall into euphoria. Especially as not even Bush himself hides the frailness of his position, particularly against the background of the pressure being exerted on the White House by various forces. Who are they?

First, there are right-wing political forces and those whom we call representatives of the military-industrial complex (I will remind those readers who consider this formula a boring old propaganda cliche that this definition was invented not by Soviet journalists but by U.S. President Eisenhower), who have plainly become more lively of late. Particularly in connection with the events in East Europe. Drawing the hasty conclusion that the Soviet Union has been turned into a "second-rate power," they see these events as an opportunity that has opened up for the United States—which they say now remains the only "superpower"—to control with impunity the destinies of the peoples of our planet.

These forces would like to make a still better-aimed strike at our perestroyka and glasnost and at the democratization of Soviet society. In their far-reaching plans they allocate to Lithuanian nationalists the role of instigators of a split in the Soviet Union and of its slide into civil war. And if there is anyone who is really interested in the use of extreme measures in Lithuania, it is precisely those who are insisting on recognizing "independent Lithuania" already today. I do not think there is any need to emphasize once again how dangerous this position is—for those who take it, what is more. They want a fire, and at the same time they think that the fire will bypass them, and yet there is no ford in a fire...

Second, there is public opinion. And here it is necessary to say at least a few words in "defense of Bush," as it were. For a long time we treated "public pressure" on the U.S. President as some trick of the U.S. "propaganda machine." But I believe that those who know America will confirm that public opinion is a very influential moral factor which, moreover, finds quite clear expression in the voices of voters. Thus a recent public opinion poll conducted by CBS in conjunction with THE NEW YORK TIMES shows that 41 percent of Americans polled believe that it is most important for them to "maintain good relations with Gorbachev," whereas 31 percent preferred "support for Lithuania's independence." And according to a poll conducted by NEWSWEEK magazine this week, two-thirds of Americans now believe that "it is more important for the United States to maintain good relations with the Soviet Union than to defend Lithuania's separatist interests in its conflict with the Soviet Government."

This is how things stand on the "other" side of the face-off. And on our side? The Lithuanian leadership is continuing to stoke the atmosphere, exploiting perestroyka for destructive purposes, and stabbing it in the back. Its hasty actions leave less and less room for political approaches. And yet Moscow (many Western observers agree with this) is showing the maximum patience and restraint.

I will point out that this position also reflects the international aspect of this problem—rather, the role of the policy of new thinking in the approach to the Lithuanian problem.

Of course, in choosing the methods and means of resolving this problem, we will proceed above all from our internal interests, above all from the interests of the multinational federation—the Soviet Union. But perestroyka belongs to the whole world. And the tremendous international authority of the policy of new thinking and the authority of the USSR president have already become, in my view, our national asset, of a sort, and, it seems to me, an internal factor. In short, it is a question of a very close interconnection, of broad interaction between the internal and external factors. It could be

said that the whole world has arrived at perestroyka through suffering. And it would be foolhardy to throw it beneath the feet of Lithuanian nationalists who have lost all sense of reality and responsibility.

Hence this conclusion: Today not only we but also Washington must show restraint and understanding. The level to which Soviet-U.S. relations have now risen is also an internal factor, of a sort, for Washington. In any case this is a joint asset, common valuable capital. We must protect it together. If it is cast to the winds, the U.S. side will also suffer to no less a degree.

And again: The date of the new Soviet-U.S. summit meeting has been announced. Not so much time is left. And it should be filled not with forced "battles" over Lithuania but with the preparation of specific accords—above all, on questions of arms reduction and disarmament. For it is on this that the meeting's success will chiefly depend.

President Gorbachev and President Bush give assurances that they are ready to move toward each other. Let us hope that no one will succeed in once again placing new barriers on this path. Who needs barriers when the time-tested "roundtable" already exists?

## Roundtable Views U.S. Attitude on Lithuania

*LD1504143790 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1130 GMT 15 Apr 90*

["International Observers Roundtable" program hosted by Bosir Andrianov, with Moscow Radio foriegn policy commentators Nikohlay Agayants and Gennadiy Vedenyapin]

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] [Vedenyapin] Incidentally, the head of the White House, despite the obvious pressure being put on the Administration by those who would like to hinder my improvement in Soviet-U.S. relations, despite all this, at a meeting with representatives of American organizations bringing together U.S. citizens who emigrated from the Baltic republics, he stated that the United States should avoid any actions that might complicate a situation that is already strained enough.

[Andranov] Urged to give de facto recognition to Lithuania, George Bush replied, as White House press spokesman Fitzwater reported, that he did not intend to do so. We believe, said Fitzwater, that our present position is correct and the president has not indicated that we are ready to change that position.

Incidentally, many people in the United States viewed Comrade Shevardnadze's talks in Washington in the light of what is happening in Lithuania. This came through particularly in the tone of press and television comment. Nor did the American lawmakers remain on the sidelines; indeed some of them made it look as if the Lithuanian issue has now become virtually the most topical international problem, one on which the future development of Soviet-U.S. relations should hinge.

Let's be honest about it: In past times of confrontation, acute domestic problems whether in the Soviet Union or in the United States traditionally led to endeavors by the other side to give advice on how to solve them, or to put it simply, to attempts to gain political capital. You would think, however, that times have not changed.

[Agayants] Yes, there is no doubt about it, times have changed. Nonetheless, even not there are many American senators and congressmen who cannot resist the temptation to behave as before. They literally timed their resolutions in support of Lithuanian independence, demanding a harsher line from the U.S. Government towards the Soviet Union to coincide with the Shevardnadze-Baker talks.

[Andrianov] Well, what can one say? The categorical tone and the attempts to instruct us what to do, when and how to solve our domestic problems, all this is simply improper in respect of the sovereign rights of the Soviet people and their constitutional bodies of power. I think those resolutions you mentioned can only be regarded as interference in the internal affairs of our state, interference which, of course, runs counter to the norms and principles of international law.

[Vedenyapin] I do not think I would be mistaken in saying that those in the United States who proceed from the need to defend the Constitution and laws of their own country must respect the similar line that we are taking. The Soviet leadership is more interested then anybody else in resolving the situation that has arisen in Lithuania by political means, through dialogue in the context of perestroyka. And this was mentioned by Comrade Shevardnadze during the Washington talks, where he stressed that it is through honest dialogue that we wish a solution that caters for the interests of all Soviet peoples, of the entire union and, of course, of the Lithuanian people.

[Agayants] But is this attempt by the American lawmakers furthering this aim? Not by any means. Their attempt to influence the processes in Lithuania, far from being aimed at achieving a rapid settlement to the problem, merely helps to further exacerbate the confrontation between different groups in Lithuania's population. One can only fail to take this into account if one is extremely unwilling to come to terms with the real state of affairs and closes one's eyes to obvious facts.

[Vedenyapin] I may be mistaken, but I am getting the impression that so far, as at least, the White House is taking into account the feelings of the majority of the American public. And, it must be said, it takes an understanding view of the Soviet leadership's actions, actions aimed at settling the Lithuanian problem, and believes that maintaining good relations with the Soviet Union is far more important than support from the Washington Administration for separatist feelings in the Baltics. This is confirmed, as you know, by public

opinions polls and articles that have appeared recently in the U.S. press. [passage omitted]

### Zorin Comments on Upcoming Summit With U.S.

*LD1504095590 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 14 Apr 90*

["Moscow Viewpoint," by Valentin Zorin; read by announcer]

[Text] The agreement to hold the Soviet-American summit between 30 May and 3 June is rightfully regarded as the main political news of the last few months. Even if we refrain from predicting the outcome of the meeting we can speak already now about it as a great accomplishment. This is because the meeting has turned out to be real despite the emergence of all the difficulties. In the old time it would have been unthinkable to hold such a meeting against such a background. If we go several years back and imagine what would have happened in Moscow and Washington had certain recent events taken place then and not today—like the tearing down of the Berlin Wall, the removal from power of the communist parties in certain East European countries, developments in Lithuania, and many other latest events. Not only these events taken together, but each one of them separately could have led to very serious consequences for the entire world.

Whether we like some developments in Eastern Europe or not, but the time of the notorious Brezhnev Doctrine has receded into the past. The new political thinking born in Moscow provides for a well-guarded approach to what happens in other countries. This new thinking amounts to the recognition of the right of every nation to choose its own way of development and to the awareness that every country should finally adopt a course geared to its own national interests.

Or let's imagine how the situation around Lithuania would have looked had it occurred not today but say early in the eighties. Imagine how Washington would have reacted to it, the Washington that announced then a crusade against the Soviet Union, and what the reaction of the Kremlin would have been. We feel today how international relations have changed. No matter how harsh the criticism of some Western politicians is, developments around Lithuania are discussed in the form of a dialogue. That could be seen on the example of the recent Soviet-American talks in Washington. The Soviet foreign minister discussed all the problems, including Lithuania, with the American President and the secretary of state in a constructive atmosphere. I have no intention to simplify the situation or ignore the fuss raised around Lithuania in the American Congress or in the media, writes Valentin Zorin. I don't want to say that I pay no attention to statements at the recent fullscale meeting of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee in Moscow of those who do not like the stand on development in Eastern Europe taken by the Soviet leadership. In the light of the current difficult situation I find it even more impressive that the leaders of the two countries still have agreed to meet in in Washington in several weeks' time. It's a fact of great international importance, showing how far away the world has gone today from that dangerous line on which it stood only recently.

### Kornilov Stresses Arms Cuts for Summit Agenda

*LD1304145190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0930 GMT 13 Apr 90*

[From the "International situation: Questions and Answers" program presented by Sergey Pravdin, foreign political commentator of All-Union Radio; with the participation of Yuriy Kornilov, TASS political observer]

[Text] [Pravdin] Greetings, esteemed comrades. There are events in the world which immediately enter the annals of international affairs as one of the most important and most memorable of their pages. Soviet-U.S. summit meetings are undoubtedly among such events, meetings of the leaders of the two great powers on the policy and interrelations of which the whole political situation in the world depends to a large extent. That is why the announcement of another of these meetings, of the forthcoming visit by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev to the United States which, as is known, will take place 30 May to 3 June, immediately attracted the attention of the international public and press.

Many of our listeners ask what the world is expecting from the meeting of the two countries' presidents, from the Soviet-U.S. summit talks. This is asked, in particular, by war veteran Vasiliy Dmitriyevich Anekeyev from Orel, Grigoriy Federovich Vinopurov from Komsomolsk na Amure, Yana Andreyevna Makarova from the town of Feodosiya, Timofey Ivanovich Kasatkin from the town of Engels, Saratov oblast, Aleksey Nikolayevich Arishev from Tomsk, and also Comrades Fidulin from Chelyabinsk, Saravik from Lipetsk, Khrechenko from the town of Bogoroditsk, Tula oblast, and many others.

We have with us in the studio today, TASS political observer Yuriy Kornilov. Please.

[Kornilov] If one is to speak about the most important part of the forthcoming dialogue, about what the success of the meeting mainly depends upon, it is, of course, the question of reducing armaments and of disarmament. For, what is at issue here are such cardinal questions as the reduction by 50 percent of the most powerful and formidable weapons that the USSR and the United States have at their disposal, strategic offensvie weapons. Also under discussion is a sharp reduction in which are known as conventional weapons and new steps along the path of banning nuclear tests and banning chemical weapons. In itself this list confirms what vast importance the forthcoming summit meeting can have, and we must hope, will have for the fate of the world. For, is it necessary to prove that when two such powers as the USSR and the United States expand cooperation in

disarmament and strengthen mutual trust the whole political climate on the planet improves.

[Pravdin] This is true, but only if the process of radical reduction of armaments makes palpable progress. But, can it be said that the problems connected with the elaboration of the treaty on strategic offensive weapons have already been resolved or at least predetermined?

[Kornilov] I think that such a conclusion is premature. The problem is too complicated. And, during the recent visit to the United States by our Foreign Minster Eduard Amvrosiyevich Shevardnadze, it was noted that during the discussion of this problem, the sides had come up against certain complications. Indeed, it would have been difficult to expect anything else, for the position of the United States Adminstration has, previously too, contained certain inconsistencies. On the one hand, Washington recognizes that the so-called Soviet military threat is no more than a stereotype of the past. Even Cheney, the Pentagon boss, admitted a few days ago that the USSR is demonstrating a clear effort to put an end to the decades of hostility. But, on the other hand, calls are still being made there for the United States' and NATO's might to be maintained at a high level.

It is for that reason, primarily, that success has not yet been achieved in reaching agreement on such important elements of the agreement on strategic offensive weapons as air-based and sea-based missiles. In short, the path to resolving such a pivotal problem as the reduction of strategic offensive weapons does not by any means recall the smooth level sidewalk of Nevskiy Prospekt [Leningrad's main street].

However, it is important to bear something else in mind: Talks are being held. Both sides, at least up to now, have demonstrated the striving to complete them successfully and express the hope that at the next meeting of the heads of the foreign policy departments of the two states—and let me remind you that U.S. Secretary of State Baker is due to come to Moscow on 16 May—there will be a discussion of all questions about the strategic offensive weapons treaty which have not yet been resolved and that mutually acceptable solutions will be found. This was the spirit of what was said at the recent press conference in Washington by Eduard Amvrosiyevich Shevardnadze, too.

I would add one thing to what he said: If one casts a glance at the political path the USSR and the United States have traversed in recent years, there is every ground to assert that if the sides have the corresponding political will, and having already overcome confrontation, they really intend to place relations between the two states on the rails of mutual understanding and cooperation, the obstacles on the path toward agreements, even the major obstacles, can be overcome successfully.

This is confirmed most convincingly, by the way, by the well-known accord between the USSR and the United States on the elimination of medium-range missiles in Europe. Is not the same thing shown by the impressive progress that already has been achieved in the discussion of such an urgent question as the preparation of a convention on banning chemicals weapons?

[Pravdin] The last Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Malta, as is known, was not so long ago, but in the time that has passed since then, much has changed in our stormy and so-agitated world. One must expect that these changes will be reflected in the agenda of the forthcoming Moscow-Washington talks. Is that no so?

[Kornilov] Undoubtedly. You are right to say that the world is going through a stormy period. Particularly great changes are taking place in Europe, and neither Moscow nor Washington, naturally, can remain aloof. As Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev stressed in his replies to questions from PRAVDA, the USSR and the United States are active and influential participants in the all-European process; and they also bear responsibility for insuring that the changes that have begun on our continent—and the unification of Germany in the first instance—should proceed in a constructive manner, without harming anyone at all, in the interests of the whole of Europe and the world.

Consequently, the complex of European affairs is an important, an extremely important point on the agenda of the forthcoming summit meeting. I am not going to go deeply into the essence of these problems at the moment. They are quite complicated, and require a particularly detailed discussion, but I will say only that our country is resolutely in favor of all of these problems, and primarily the question of the settlement of the external aspects of the construction of Germany unity, being examined, taking into account the legitimate concern of the European states and from the point of view of preserving and strengthening stability on the continent.

On 10 April, when he received British Foreign Secretary Hurd, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev stressed once again that a solution must be found in creating security structures for the whole of Europe, from the Atlantic to the Urals. This position is meeting with understanding and increasingly active support from sober-minded politicians in various countries. Not confrontation, but the striving to overcome it, the desire to build the all-European home should predominate in relations between countries, West German Foreign Minister Genscher rightly noted when he spoke in Washington a few days ago.

By the way, we would not be objective if while speaking of the changes taking place in our dynamic world we limited ourselves only to references to Europe. Similar changes, and quite considerable ones, also are taking place thousands of miles from the shores of Europe. Let us recall, at least, the changes in Nicaragua and the progress achieved in southern Africa. In this connection, it is appropriate to speak about Soviet-U.S. cooperation in settling regional conflicts, that in the examination of these problems Moscow and Washington increasingly often are increasingly playing, as it were, in the same

ballpark. This means that during the forthcoming summit meeting, important new steps can be made, aimed at gradually eliminating what are known as the hotspots of the planet.

[Pravdin] But here is another question. The last in a sequence, but by no means the last in importance. What can be expected from the forthcoming summit meeting in the sphere of bilateral relations?

[Kornilov] I can say confidently that our countries have broad prospects here. Comrade Shevardnadze called the recent exchange of opinions on bilateral relations in Washington very productive. And this description is completely justified. After Malta serious work got under way in Moscow and Washington to create a reliable foundation for Soviet-U.S. cooperation, primarily in the trade and economic sphere. What is at issue is a whole range of major agreements on trade, investments, and so on. Intensive work is being conducted on this now by our experts and American ones.

A few days ago the Pentagon announced the abolition of licensing of supplies to the USSR of certain types of computers. Some 150 U.S. companies are engaged in setting up joint enterprises. President Bush has approved the idea of cooperation with our country in the sphere of mastering space. As the newspaper SPACE NEWS reports, the administration is planning to begin talks with the USSR, Japan, Canada, and Western European countries on establishing an international base on the moon and organizing a manned flight to Mars.

The list of such impressive initiatives could be continued, although of course one should not, one should not at all disregard the fact that artificial impediments to the development of Soviet-U.S. relations, primarily in the sphere of trade and economics, still exist in spite of the fact that at present it is being increasingly recognized in Washington, too, that these impediments are remnants from the Cold War.

[Pravdin] Some people recognize this. But others, including some congressmen, seem to be seeking new pretexts so as to complicate in some way the development of good relations between our countries. In the attempt to heat up passions they make intensive appeals quoting events around Lithuania.

[Kornilov] That is true. The increasing mutual understanding and cooperation between Moscow and Washington is not to the liking of everyone in the United States of America. However, if one looks at the administration's position, I would say that at least up until now, it has maintained a considered approach to the events around Lithuania. Such eminent U.S. politicians as Senators Mitchell and Dole, and they are not the only ones, have expressed support for the Soviet leadership's plans to resolve the problem by means of dialogue. And President Bush, in his conversation with Shevardandze, expressed a similar point of view, and in response to this our foreign minister with complete justification stated that precisely open and honest dialogue was the principled course, in accord with the ideals of perestroyka, which had been firmly adopted by the leadership of the Soviet side.

In summing up the results of our discussion, I would like to return once again to Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's recent replies to questions from PRAVDA and recall his words that Soviet-U.S. summit meetings are a very important element in world politics and that he, the president of the USSR, is counting on a detailed and free discussion and on expanding the sphere of trust in relations between the USSR and the United States of America. It has been stated clearly and precisely. The strengthening of trust between the two great powers, the strengthening of their cooperation for the sake of security and peace. This is what is hoped; this is expected from the forthcoming summit meeting by the peoples of our countries and the public of all continents.

## Dubinin, U.S.'s Hills on Trade Contacts

*LD1304134990 Moscow TASS in English 1323 GMT 13 Apr 90*

[Text] Washington April 13 TASS—The United States seeks free and open talks with East European countries on the basis of economic reforms to establish a market, Carla Hills, U.S. representative at trade talks, told a symposium dealing with prospects for the development of business relations with Eastern Europe and the USSR.

She noted that the promotion of reforms in these countries clearly accords with U.S. interests for strategic, trade and humanitarian reasons.

Hills noted that nobody expects that changes in their economies would take place in a twinkling of an eye. However, it is evident that these countries have a "huge potential" to import goods and services and to produce goods in demand.

Dealing with what specific measures the Washington administration intends to take to assist the economic metamorphosis in Eastern Europe, Hills mentioned purposeful assistance, the drafting of agreements on trade and investments and the involvement of Eastern Europe in the global trade system through economic organisations, including GATT.

Presidents Bush and Gorbachev plan to sign a trade agreement between the United States and the Soviet Union during the summit in Washington late in May, she continued.

A Soviet-U.S. trade agreement, the draft of which is actively being discussed, is "the most important start", Soviet Ambassador to the U.S. Yuriy Dubinin stressed in his speech at the seminar.

"The talks are being conducted in a constructive spirit," he continued, expressing hope that an agreement would be signed during the Soviet-American summit next May-June.

"We expect that the forthcoming Soviet-American summit will ensure progress towards such a political and economic climate which would promote economic cooperation between our countries," the ambassador noted.

"We are convined that real economic interaction accords with the interests of all stages and is a contribution to settling global economic, social and ecological problems facing mankind."

Dubinin expressed confidence that "the Soviet-American dialogue and cooperation would be very useful in this context".

### U.S. Congress Refusal of UN Debts Funds Reported

*PM1004130190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 10 Apr 90 Morning Edition p 4*

[Report by own correspondent A. Shalnev: "Congress Makes Choice"]

[Text] New York—U.S. Congress has refused to allocate the Washington administration sufficient funds to extinguish part of the country's debt to the United Nations.

THE NEW YORK TIMES reports that Congress gave a sufficiently simple reason for its decision: The money intended for the United Nations has to a considerable extent gone on rendering emergency aid to those who suffered from the California earthquake and Hurricane Hugo, which swept over the country's southeast seaboard states.

The legislators took this step despite the insistent recommendations of President Bush, who was seeking to ensure that the United States pay off as soon as possible the very substantial debts it has accumulated. As of late January this year the United States owed the United Nations over $500 million, not counting the slightly more than $200 million which will be added in the course of the present year of 1990.

Actually, we too are not very far behind the United States. Our debts, together with the sum which we have to submit to the regular UN budget this year, was, according to the figures of the UN Secretariat for late January, over $220 million. It is a case of the debts both of the Soviet Union and of the Ukraine and Belorussia.

The USSR's share in contributions to the UN regular budget, which does not include expenses on the maintenance of UN troops in the most diverse parts of the world—those come under separate headings—has been set at 9.99 percent, with Belorussia's share being 0.33 percent and the Ukraine's 1.25 percent. For the sake of comparison the figures are 25 percent for the United States, 0.79 percent for China, 11.38 percent for Japan, 6.25 percent for France, and o.05 percent for Trinidad and Tobago.

According to THE NEW YORK TIMES UN Secretary General Perez de Cuellar has asked President Bush to put pressure on congress and achieve the earmarking of the sums needed to cover the United States' debts. Otherwise, UN officials warn, a financial crisis may arise in the United Nations by the summer.

I have not the slightest doubt that President Bush will attempt to bring pressure to bear: After all, just a few months ago his administration solemnly proclaimed that it would like to end its debtor status. But it is highly dubious whether Congress will give in to the pressure. When the budget is suffering a gigantic deficit and when a choice has to be made between those who suffered as the result of catastrophic natural disasters and needs which are in general abstract to the U.S. people, it is not difficult to surmise which Congress will choose.

### Daily Views Bush-Thatcher Talks in Bermuda

*PM1504192190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 Apr 90 Morning Edition p 4*

[Unnamed own correspondent dispatch: "Meeting in Bermuda"]

[Text] London—The four hours which U.S. President G. Bush and Prime Minister M. Thatcher of Great Britain spent together in Bermuda on the eve of the Easter holiday were devoted to discussing a wide range of questions. The main ones among them were East-West relations in the light of the processes under way in Europe, prospects for the unification of Germany, and disarmament problems.

Summing up their impressions from the talks, both politicians noted that a useful exchange of opinions had taken place. The U.S. side stressed what official London wanted to hear above all—namely that the special relationship between the United States and Great Britain remains intact. According to M. Thatcher, the need to preserve NATO as the basis of the West's defense and to retain the presence of U.S. forces and nuclear weapons in Europe was noted.

British commentaries on the first reports which have been received from Bermuda also do not ignore the reaction of G. Bush and M. Thatcher to the development of events around Lithuania. Both the President and the prime minister stressed again that this problem must be resolved only by means of talks.

The President and the prime minister were largely in agreement on other questions. Differences, not to mention conflicts, were avoided by the participants in the British-American summit, as was expected. They also looked like a harmonious couple at the final press conference, even when they tried to take part in a traditional Bermuda pastime—kite-flying—which requires great skill and dexterity.

Political scientists in both London and Washington, and of course also in other world capitals of the world, will for a long time yet try to decipher the meaning of every word that was said in the course of the summit which has

just ended. However, it is possible to say right now that it was by no means of equal significance for the two partners.

For the President it was no more than the first round of a series of consultations which he is planning to hold on the eve of his upcoming talks with the Soviet president. It was interesting for him, of course, to obtain firsthand information on the content of the talks held by UK Foreign Secretary D. Hurd with the Soviet leadership during his official visit to Moscow last week.

Unquestionably, the prime minister informed Bush about her attitude to the problem of German unification, which is marked by particular circumspection and caution. Furthermore, M. Thatcher is more committed to the idea of retaining nuclear arms in Europe than other NATO country leaders. This emphasis also rang out in Bermuda.

However, for the head of the Conservative cabinet the rendezvous with the President was significant not just in foreign policy terms. M. Thatcher is currently in great need of any appreciable proof that she is regarded as a prestigious international leader. This heightened sensitivity is due above all to domestic difficulties. Furthermore, as a result of differences with EEC partners, M. Thatcher finds it more difficult now to talk to Washington on behalf of the whole of West Europe, as was the case under the Reagan presidency.

The prime minister wanted to show everyone that the special Anglo-American relationship has lost none of its stability or topicality. And what was even more important for Thatcher, whose government is attracting mounting criticism in Britain, was to demonstrate that, unlike Labor, she enjoys an exceptional credit of confidence across the ocean.

## China

### PRC Premier Li Peng To Visit Moscow 23-26 Apr

*LD1304155190 Moscow TASS in English 1517 GMT 13 Apr 90*

[Text] Moscow April 13 TASS—It has been announced here that Li Peng, premier of the State Council of the People's Republic of China, will pay an official visit to the Soviet Union on April 23-26 at the invitation of the Soviet Government.

### Improving Sino-Soviet Ties Outlined, Praised

*LD1504153790 Moscow TASS in English 1519 GMT 15 Apr 90*

[By TASS political analyst Yuriy Kornilov]

[Text] Moscow April 15 TASS—Li Peng, prime minister of the Chinese State Council, will arrive in Moscow on an official visit in a week's time—on April 23.

Appraising Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to China a year ago, it is noted in Beijing that the visit's results can be expressed by eight Chinese characters which mean "forget the past, open up the future". Li Peng's forthcoming visit to the Soviet Union is expected to continue and deepen the fruitful process which meets hopes and aspirations of the two nations and influences the situation in Asia and the world in a positive manner.

The Soviet Union and China have arrived at the firm conclusion that now that the period of mutual alienation is over, relations between the two countries should be based on universal principles of inter-state communication. These principles include respect for sovereignty and territorial integrity, equality, mutual advantage and peaceful coexistence. The strict observance of these principles is a guarantee of making relations between the Soviet Union and China not only stable but truly good-neighbourly. Is there a need to stress that the consolidation of Moscow-Beijing good-neighbourhood is fully consonant with the tendencies to normalise the international climate which are increasingly growing in importance in the present world situation?

The normalisation and improvement of Moscow-Beijing relations have imparted a powerful impulse to the creation of an interaction mechanism between the two countries with the help of which Soviet-Chinese links and cooperation are developing and consolidating in various fields.

The sides exchange views on pressing international issues—while retaining complete independence in their assessments, naturally. The visit of a delegation from the USSR Supreme Soviet to China at the end of 1989, during which a number of urgent problems of the development of legislation came under discussion, proved very fruitful. Inter-party relations are being adjusted and filled with specific content. Diplomats and military experts are conducting talks aimed at the mutual reduction of armed forces and building confidence in the area of the Soviet-Chinese border which stretches for 7,300 kilometers.

Soviet-Chinese trade, economic, scientific and technical links are expanding. The volume of mutual commodity turnover reached a record high of 2.4 billion roubles last year. This year the 1989 level of deliveries will be exceeded by another 36 per cent. There is no doubt that the forthcoming talks will enable the countries to fuller use the rich potential of our business cooperation that serves as a dependable material basis of good-neighbourliness.

The tasks the Soviet Union and China set themselves are similar—to strengthen and renew socialism, to impart to it qualities capable of meeting the challenge of the times. Although differences in the two countries' history, political practice and national peculiarities exclude mechanical doubling in the very approaches of Moscow and Beijing towards the solution of problems posed by social development, there are many points of similarity.

Soviet-Chinese meetings and talks are the correct way to gain a better, fuller idea of each other's experience.

At a recent meeting in Beijing with a delegation of Soviet journalists, of which the author of this comment was a member, Li Peng said "We want to develop friendly, good-neighbourly relations with the Soviet Union because such relations are of great importance for the preservation of peace and development both in the Far East and in the whole world. The peoples of our two countries must live in peace and friendship".

The Soviet people share this desire—to live in peace and friendship with the great neighbour. The Chinese People's Republic. Welcome to Moscow, Comrade Li Peng.

## Reportage on Visit by PRC General Song Wenzhong

### Visit Concludes 12 Apr

*PM1504190990 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 14 Apr 90 First Edition p 5*

[Unattributed report: "Visit Over"]

[Text] A PRC military delegation headed by Major General Song Wenzhong, chief of the PRC Defense Ministry External Relations Directorate, has paid an official visit to the Soviet Union.

The delegation was received by Army General M.A. Moiseyev, chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff and USSR first deputy defense minister, and by Lieutenant Gen. V.I. Grebenyuk, deputy chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate. The Chinese guests visited Leningrad and Volgograd. During the visit they familiarized themselves with the training and daily life of Soviet servicemen.

"Does your visit mean that, now that Soviet-Chinese relations are developing successfully, ties will also be developed along military lines?"—a KRASNAYA ZVEZDA correspondent put this question to Maj. Gen. Song Wenzhong.

"I have come to the USSR on an official visit at the invitation of Rear Admiral V.Zh. Khuzhokov, chief of the USSR Defense Ministry External Relations Directorate. China and the Soviet Union are great neighboring countries linked by mountains and rivers in common. And our peoples and armies are linked by traditional friendship," Maj. Gen. Song Wenzhong emphasized. "Following the meetings of the top leaders of the PRC and the USSR last May, relations between our two countries embarked on the path of normalization. In addition, contacts between our armies are being restored and developed—which is a constituent part of the relations between our two countries. And this is natural. Both China's Army and the Soviet Union's Army have their merits. The development of ties and contacts between our two armies will be able not only to expand our two countries' relations but also to boost their further development. I have noticed that the Soviet side, like ours, has a desire to develop our armies' contacts. I have an optimistic attitude toward this.

"During our stay in the USSR the Soviet comrades have shown us warm hospitality. We have felt profoundly the friendliness of the Soviet people and Army toward the Chinese people and their Army. I have come here with the feeling of friendship and love of the Chinese people and Army toward the Soviet people and Army. I will certainly convey your friendliness to the Chinese people and our Army. I would like to take this opportunity to ask KRASNAYA ZVEZDA to convey our friendly feeling toward the Soviet people and the Soviet Army," Maj. Gen. Song Wenzhong pointed out in conclusion.

The Chinese delegation left for home 12 April. It was seen off at the airport by Rear Adm. V.Zh. Khuzhokov, chief of the USSR Defense Ministry External Relations Directorate. The sendoff party included Major General Ning Wenyang, military attache at the PRC Embassy in the USSR.

### Song Wenzhong Assesses Talks

*LD1304110390 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0610 GMT 13 Apr 90*

[Text] Moscow, 13 Apr (TASS)—"The main impression of my visit to the USSR consists of the following: The Soviet people and their Armed Forces have the most warm and friendly feelings toward the people of the PRC," said Major General Song Wenzhong, chief of the Foreign Affairs Bureau of the PRC Ministry of National Defense. He gave an interview on 12 April to TASS correspondent Oleg Moskovskiy in connection with the conclusion of his 10-day visit to the USSR. The general added that China and the USSR wish to develop friendship and cooperation between each other in all spheres.

According to the guest, this official military visit by the Chinese military delegation is the first in 30 years. "That is why the purpose of my visit may be seen as the restoration of lost contacts," Gen. Song Wenzhong said. He noted with satisfaction that this had been accomplished in full measure.

According to the bureau chief, he met with Army General Mikhail Moiseyev, chief of the General Staff of the USSR Armed Forces, exchanging opinions with him on a broad range of questions, and chatted with the leaders of the Chief Political Directorate of the Soviet Army and Navy. The guest also visited a number of military installations, as well as the hero-cities of Leningrad and Volgograd.

In the general's opinion, the Soviet Armed Forces have normal relations with many armies of the world. "That is why our armies should not be isolated from one another," the Chinese guest stressed. In his opinion an improvement in Soviet-Chinese relations in the military sphere will not only be of benefit to our countries, but also will serve the cause of peace throughout the world.

"I view the future development of our relations in the military sphere with optimism," Gen. Song said in conclusion.

### Riot Reported Near Soviet Border in Xinjiang

*OW1504211590 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 1400 GMT 15 Apr 90*

[Text] In a televised speech, an official of the Xinjiang Autonomous Regional Government called on soldiers and civilians in the autonomous region to raise their vigilance to guard against any riot in areas near the Soviet border. Western observers pointed out that this is the first reaction by the regional government after Islamites in Xinjiang staged a riot from 5 to 6 April. The riot took place in Kashi, which is a Chinese border city only dozens of kilometers away from the Soviet Kirgiz border.

According to Western media, 50 people died in a clash with the police. China has sent more troops to the autonomous region. At the same time, the government has not given out any official information on the casualties. A Chinese official said that the situation in Xinjiang remains stable and that foreign tourists can still tour the region.

## Northeast Asia

### New USSR-ROK Air Routes Promote Relations

*SK1504110090 Moscow International Service in Korean 0900 GMT 13 Apr 90*

[Text] One of our station reporters returned from Seoul after making a trip there aboard the first flight along the new air route between Moscow and Seoul. Here is his report.

A plane with a red flag bearing the hammer and sickle, which once aroused horror in the residents over there, is arriving in Seoul, and the Boeing 747 passenger planes bearing the mark of Korean Air, the symbol of the ROK [word indistinct] which [words indistinct] that disappeared from the sky over Sakhalin in September 1983, are arriving at the Moscow airport.

The times are changing like this. The Soviet perestroyka and the development of relations between the East and West as a result of perestroyka and a certain change in Seoul's foreign policy have stimulated the establishment of direct relations between the Soviet Union and the ROK.

Despite the fact that there are no diplomatic relations between our two countries, trade and economic exchanges are being accelerated. Among the examples is the business agreement signed between the Soviet civil aviation company, Aeroflot, and the Korean civil aviation company, Korean Air. This agreement brought about direct, regular flights between the capitals of the two countries. To date, the ROK passenger planes have flown along the air route in the Arctic region to reach nine cities in Europe. By flying in Soviet air space, they can reduce the flight time by nearly 4 hours, thereby saving millions of dollars.

According to an analysis of experts, the air route connecting Western Europe, Moscow, and Seoul and that connecting Khabarovsk, Seoul, and Singapore are of great significance in [word indistinct] international transport comparable to the major air routes in Europe and Asia.

The Russians and the Koreans reached agreement more swiftly than the Koreans and the Americans did. South Korea and the United States have not been able to narrow their difference of opinion in the aviation talks that have continued for years. The Korean Air is waiting for the United States to allow it to fly to the U.S. cities through Chicago and San Francisco and to the South American countries through the United States.

The first flight from Moscow to Seoul was called a [word indistinct] technological fight, and the Aeroflot delegation headed by Boris Panyukov, first deputy minister of civil aviation of the Soviet Union, also took part in this first flight. (Boris Ligachev), deputy director of the International Business Administration Department of the Civil Aviation Ministry of the Soviet Union, who signed the agreement with the ROK civil aviation company, told the reporter aboard the (?IL-62) plane:

[Begin (Ligachev) recording in Russian fading into Korean translation] The well-known Vladivostok speech by Comrade Gorbachev provided a basis for cooperation between the Soviet Union and South Korea. The essence of his speech was to promote cooperation with the countries in Asia and the Pacific region. We expressed our interest in the South Korean proposal to begin cooperation in the field of civil aviation. As for the business aspect of the agreement signed, Aeroflot always starts from a give-and-take position in conducting talks with any airline companies. We regard the Korean Air company as a reliable counterpart. [end recording]

The passengers traveling aboard airplanes of various airline companies are interested, in the first place, in the safety of the flight and the services given in the plane. When I asked (Vladimir Bolchenkin), chief pilot of the passenger plane, how many years he had piloted Soviet passenger planes, he replied:

[Begin (Bolchenkin) recording in Russian fading into Korean translation] I have been piloting planes for (?29) years. I first (?attended school) in the Arctic region, and this is a good school. I have been to the Arctic region, landed on the [word indistinct] ice, and led a group of ships via the Arctic Ocean. I have flown to Antarctica, and have piloted passenger planes on a number of occasions when new international air routes were opened. I was always proud of that, for these flights help the countries and peoples come close to each other and

promote mutual understanding. The more frequently we fly to each other, the more our relations are promoted. [end recording]

Then what do the first passengers of the new air route think? Mr (Yu Pyong-mo), an ROK businessman, says:

[Begin (Yu Pyong-mo) recording] Congratulations on the first flight of Aeroflot! I will do (?my best) to send tourists to Moscow, to pioneer the travel routes by land and the air routes. Today, I am aboard the plane which is [word indistinct] for the first time. I hope that this air route between the Soviet Union and the ROK will expedite the normalization of diplomatic relations between the Soviet Union and the ROK. I am glad of this historic moment of flying from the Soviet Union to the ROK by the [word indistinct]. I pray that the two countries will prosper through the promotion of friendship and the establishment of diplomatic relations between the two countries. [end recording]

Seoul placed great significance on the establishment of the new air route. This is proven by the grand welcome accorded the Soviet passenger plane and by the reception to which the most outstanding political, working, financial, and mass media representatives were invited. Among the figures invited to the reception were Mr. Kim Yong-sam, Mr Kim Chong-pil, co-leaders of the Democratic Liberal Party; Mr Kim Tae-chung, leader of the opposition forces, and other noted activists. At the reception, remarks and congratulatory speeches were made, in which both sides expressed the hopes for fruitful development of trade and economic relations between the two countries and the optimistic prospect of it, stressing that these relations will help improve the relations between the two countries and the overall international structure and stabilize the situation on the Korean peninsula. In this connection, warm remarks were made with respect to Aeroflot and Korean Air which contributed considerably to the attainment of these objectives. Now we will let you hear some of these remarks.

(Valeriy Nabarov), deputy director of the Soviet Chamber of Commerce and representative of the mission of the Soviet Chamber of Commerce to Seoul, said:

[Begin (Nabarov) recording in Russian fading into Korean translation] The establishment of the direct air route between the Soviet Union and the ROK is the most conspicuous result of all the accomplishments achieved in the development of bilateral relations between the two countries. This means that exchanges are made without limit in certain fields and it means complete openness between the two countries. This will help rapidly increase mutual visits, help give the Korean people access to true information about the Soviet Union, and help satisfy their enormous interest in our country. The Soviet Union has only limited knowledge about South Korea yet, and this stands in the way of promoting the development of the bilateral relations. The new air route will help overcome all these obstacles. [end recording]

Next you will hear the views by Mr (Ko Chang-song), vice president of the Korean Air company. [Begin (Ko Chang-song) recording] It is of great significance that a direct air route has been established with Aeroflot of the Soviet Union and Korean Air of the ROK. Korean Air now can fly its planes between the ROK and Europe through Soviet air space and can reduce the flight time considerably. It not only improves the efficiency of the airline company but it provides considerable expediency for the transport of passengers between the ROK and Europe. Apart from this, it is of great significance in another way as well; that Korean Air flies its planes to Moscow and Aeroflot flies its planes to Seoul. The people of the two countries have so far had to travel to each other's capital through other countries, but now they can visit Seoul and Moscow directly, thereby promoting the interests of both countries. This will also help to promote [word indistinct] between the two countries. In particular, the air route is established at this time when the prospect of the development of economic relations between the two countries is brighter than ever, and I would like to attach great significance to it because it will significantly contribute to the development of the economic relations between the two countries. I am very glad that Korean Air and Aeroflot can cooperate to contribute to the promotion of relations between the two countries. [end recording]

Congratulatory music was played, the applause abated, and the days of labor began, and time will tell whether this will bring forth the changes which have been much discussed in Seoul over the last few days and whether it will meet with the expectations expressed.

### Korean-Language Newspapers in Sakhalin Reviewed

*SK1004134790 Moscow International Service in Korean 0900 GMT 4 Apr 90*

[Unattributed talk]

[Text] Dear listeners: We will review LENIN'S ROAD, a Korean-language newspaper published in Sakhalin. This newspaper, an organ of the CPSU Sakhalin Committee, was first published in 1949. This newspaper greatly focuses on the lives of Korean people in Sakhalin. In this hour, we will introduce some of the articles of this newspaper to our listeners.

First, Sergey Kwon, a (?Korean) leader of the Korean Youth Center in Sakhalin, writes: There were a variety of symbolic campaigns in the history of our country. However, these campaigns failed to produce results. Therefore, people in our country [words indistinct]. Restructuring is a completely new phenomenon in our lives. Democratization and openness brought about [words indistinct] for Soviets. For a very long time, we believed that we were living in the happiest country in the world. Restructuring clearly showed that this is not true. In our country, crimes have been on the rise, and ethnic relations have become tense. Then, where is the exit? People in Sakhalin recognize that officials at offices and committees of the CPSU Sakhalin Committee must be

replaced by workers and peasants who enjoy the people's trust. However, I do not think so. Many leading party officials sincerely support restructuring and have a lot of experience in organizational work. We must retain them and assign them to important tasks. Only when we make use of the affirmative experiences of the past, will we be able to succeed in our work. Restructuring is not a passing phenomenon. Restructuring has become part of our lives. The destiny of restructuring depends upon us.

[Words indistinct], reporter Yi In-sil introduces a Korean-language lesson that started from February this year at Yuzhno Sakhalinsk as follows: [Passage indistinct] Koreans in Sakhalin are growingly interested in learning their mother tongue. This is because contacts with South Korea are growing. South Korean businessmen, reporters, and athletes regularly visit Yuzhno Sakhalinsk. The 13th World Festival of Youth and Students held in Pyongyang, too, contributed to this phenomenon. Korean youth from Sakhalin who participated in this festival were acquainted with their brethren [words indistinct]. Comrade Chungjin Kim, a Korean-language instructor, divided students into three groups depending upon their proficiency in Korean. In other words, some students attend classes for 6 months, and [words indistinct]. When they finish their courses, they will be given certificates of guides or interpreters. Several new study groups will be formed in the near future.

Chumakov, deputy director of the Sakhalin (?Immigration) Bureau, answers questions from readers regarding the possibility of visiting their relatives living overseas and inviting their relatives to the Soviet Union. We will briefly introduce what he said in his interview. In his interview, he said: Soviet citizens can visit their relatives living overseas only when they receive a letter of invitation from their relatives. The issue involving Soviet citizens making foreign trips at the invitation of their relatives living overseas and the issue involving Soviet citizens inviting their relatives living overseas to our country are still in their initial stage. Because names of inviters and their addresses are not clear, many difficult problems arise in issuing exit permits. For example, the Foreign Citizens [word indistinct] and Registration Department does not accept documents when new letters of invitation that list clear names and addresses are presented. It takes almost 30 days to examine documents for Soviet citizens' visits to capitalist countries, and it takes almost 15 days to examine documents for their visits to socialist countries. Sometimes, it takes longer than this for some objective reasons. The issue involving cash is also one of the complicated problems. As known, many of the old people who are leaving to visit their relatives in South Korea have no assets. Because they did not voluntarily leave their fatherland, the question of whether it is just to receive a fee of [word indistinct] for their passport and for them to exchange money at an excessively high official rate is reasonable. Finally, Chumakov recognizes that offices concerned must [word indistinct] solve problems involving old people who are leaving for overseas and must give them special treatment if necessary.

## DPRK Paper Cited on Workers' Education

*PM0404091790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 5 Apr 90 Morning Edition p 1*

[Report from TASS, REUTER, UPI roundup: "DPRK: Working People's Education Is Being Stepped Up"]

[Text] The newspaper NODONG SINMUN has called for the DPRK working people's education to be stepped up on the basis of "revolutionary relics." Stressing that this is dictated by the demands of "the present development of the situation," the newspaper writes that party members and all working people must "firmly arm themselves with revolutionary traditions and have a profound awareness of the greatness of the leader," the country's president, Kim Il-song and the "great power of influence" exerted on the population by the monuments of the class struggle which describe "vividly" the activity of Kim Il-song and his son, the "dear leader" Kim Chong-il, and which fill the working people's hearts with "a sense of national pride" in "the immortal services and wisdom of the party leadership and the leader."

## Shevardnadze Comments on Kuriles, Sakhalin

*LD1304183590 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1719 GMT 13 Apr 90*

[Excerpts] Moscow, 13 Apr (tass) "The United Nations is doing a huge amount by holding such conferences," Eduard Shevardnadze, the USSR Minister of Foreign Affairs, said this about the international conference on "Tendencies in Science and Technology: The Consequences for International Peace and Security" to be held in Japan on 16-19 April. He stated this in an interview published today in IZVESTIYA. [passage omitted]

Addressing the hosts of the conference, Eduard Shevardnadze expressed the Soviet Union's preparedness for the development of ecological cooperation with Japan. "In the interests of such cooperation," he said, "we would be prepared to open up the Kurile Islands and Sakhalin, having turned them into test areas for joint efforts in the area of nature protection."

## U.S. General's Remarks on Japan Cause Protest

*OW1604030890 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1200 GMT 15 Apr 90*

[Text] The Moscow newspaper IZVESTIYA carries an article by Tokyo correspondent Agafanov on remarks by General Stackpole, commander of the U.S. Marine Corps stationed in Okinawa, Japan.

According to the article, in an interview Gen. Stackpole gave to THE WASHINGTON POST late last month, he said that the U.S. forces in Japan are fulfilling a very important mission of checking the revival of Japanese militarism.

These remarks have caused a strong protest from the Japanese side, aggravating Japanese-U.S. relations. Consequently, a letter of reprimand was sent to Gen. Stackpole from an assistant to the U.S. Secretary of Defense.

### MPRP Congress Ends; Plenum Begins Work

*LD1304112790 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1049 GMT 13 Apr 90*

[Text] Ulaanbaatar, 13 Apr (TASS)—The extraordinary congress of the Mongolian Revolutionary Party [MPRP] ended its work here today. The delegates discussed the immediate tasks to deepen perestroyka and renew the party. The congress adopted four program documents, including the platform of the MPRP rules.

The new leading bodies of the party were elected: The Central Committee composed of 91 members, and the Central Auditing Commission, made up of 31 people.

The same day, the first plenum of the newly elected MPRP Central Committee began at which the members of the Presidium and the general secretary of the party Central Committee are to be elected.

For the first time, the chairman of the Presidium of the People's Great Hural of the Mongolian People's Republic and the head of the Mongolian Government will not be part of the supreme leading body of the MPRP, which has been transformed from Politburo to Presidium. The delegates of the first extraordinary congress in the history of the MPRP made this decision based on the need for the separation of the functions of the party and state bodies.

In the press center of the just-ended congress, representatives of the Party of National Progress disseminated a joint statement on the creation of a coalition of the new political parties and movements that have appeared in the country recently. The main aim of the coalition, in the words of the MONTESAME agency, will be "organizational participation in the preparation and holding of democratic elections."

### Chairman, Presidium Elected

*LD1304143690 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1313 GMT 13 Apr 90*

[Text] Ulaanbaatar, 13 Mar (TASS)—Gombojavyn Ochirbat was elected chairman of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party Central Committee at the first plenum of the MPRP Central Committee. G. Ochirbat, Ts. Gombosuren, N. Mishigdorj, Ts. Oold, B. Sumyaa, and L. Tudev were elected members of the MPRP Central Committee Presidium.

### Gorbachev Congratulates Mongolia's Ochirbat

*LD1504174390 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1719 GMT 15 Apr 90*

[Text] Moscow, 15, April, [TASS]—Mikhail Gorbachev has warmly congratulated Gombojabyn Ochirbat, chairman of the Central Committee of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party [MPRP], on his election to that office. He wished Gombojabyn Ochirbat and the Communists of Mongolia success in implementing the program of action of renewal of the party and society, which was adopted by the extraordinary congress of the MPRP.

### Investigative Commission Set Up in Mongolia

*LD1504121590 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0830 GMT 15 Apr 90*

[Text] Ulaanbaatar 15 April (TASS)—A special commission is to analyze objectively the activities of the entourage of the former leader of the Mongolian People's Republic and the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party [MPRP], Yumjaagiyn Tsedenbal. It has been set up with the purpose of investigating the role and participation in improper activities of each one of the former MPRP Central Committee members, candidate members, and secretaries, and the heads of the republic's Council of Ministers in the period between the start of the 1950's and mid-1984, when a command and bureaucratic system was in place in the country, and when dissidents were persecuted, reports the newspaper UNEN today.

## Near East & South Asia

### TASS Issues New Report on Aeroflot Attack

*LD1304133190 Moscow TASS in English 1315 GMT 13 Apr 90*

["Travellers Take To Sea After Security Alarm at Airport."—TASS headline; TASS substitutes this item for the item published on page 16 of the 13 April Soviet Union DAILY REPORT headlined "Arab 'Militants' Try To Attack Aeroflot Jet".]

[Text] Nicosia, April 13 TASS—Cypriot police took emergency security measures at Larnaca International Airport in response to the threat of a possible attack by extremist groups against an Aeroflot jet carrying Soviet jews on a regular flight to Israel via Cyprus.

After sealing off the airport grounds, the police escorted the passengers to the Limassol Sea Port, from where they sailed to Israel by ferry.

### Saddam Husayn's 'Provocative Declarations' Viewed

*LD1304221490 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Arabic 1300 GMT 13 Apr 90*

[Excerpts] We tackle anew the big information and political uproar raised during the recent days about Iraq and its arms. [passage omitted]

Vivid reactions have increased concerning the arms owned by Iraq and President Saddam Husayn's declarations which are full of the spirit of war. British customs

seized parts of heavy artillery which were to be transported to Iraq. The British pretend that it is question of 40-meter cannons capable of launching nuclear and chemical ammunition. British customs also seized last March electronic devices which could be used as detonators for an atomic bomb. It is noteworthy that these detonators and cannons are manufactured in Britain of course.

A great scandal truly happened, and President Saddam Husayn himself fanned these fires by declaring that his country owns huge reserves of chemical weapons and that Iraq will bombard half of Israel if the latter launches an attack. It is obvious here that President Saddam Husayn wanted to show that he does not own nuclear arms. However, this had the totally opposite effect. Israel was also involved in the scandal when Iraq threatened to deal a strong blow to it, which led to an extreme escalation of the situation.

There is an impression that all the parties involved in the scandal are working to the same end. The Israeli hawks obviously benefit from this. By referring to Saddam Husayn's provocative declarations which are full of the spirit of war, they are given an opportunity to launch a chauvinistic campaign inside Israel at a time when Shimon Peres is trying to form his new government which seemingly will agree to negotiate with the Palestinians. They were also given the green light to cry out to the whole world about the Arabs' bloodthirstiness and deception. The opportunity was also given to the reactionary mass media and circles in the Western countries to talk about Arab terrorism and threaten their citizens with the alleged Soviet danger in their search for an alternative enemy in the Middle East.

The Baghdad leadership steals great benefits and profits from this uproar, at a time when it has become clear that the country needs democratic change. After the heavy burden carried by the Iraqi people during a horrible eight-year war, the leadership promised these changes, but instead of democracy, Iraq was subjected to a campaign in search of enemies. [passage omitted]

Baghdad has understood that this campaign has acquired destructive dimensions. It is unlikely that it acquires a good reputation among the international community when it threatens to use chemical weapons.

Yes, President Saddam Husayn of Iraq has shown political wisdom and, in his talk with a group of American congressmen, stressed his readiness to scrap all the arms of total destruction if Israel is ready to do the same thing. It is true that this step is reasonable. What does Israel say to this?

### Comparison to Iranian Hostage Policy

*NC1304152090*

Moscow in Persian to Iran at 1100 GMT on 13 April carries a commentary on Iranian policy on the release of the hostages. This has been compared to the referent Moscow Dari version, which was published on page 18 of the 13 April Soviet Union DAILY REPORT under the headline "Iran's Policy Urging Hostages' Release Viewed," and was found to be identical except for the following variation:

Page 18, paragraph three, last sentence reads: "...persons were released.

Our commentator then writes: At the same time, it is not improbable that the release of the three Western hostages may have become possible because of Tehran's stand. As was formerly reported, Abu Nidal contacted Iranian representatives and his subordinates had handed over some of the 17 Western hostages to the pro-Islamic organizations in Lebanon.

At the same..." (supplying indistinct passage)

## East Europe

### Polish President Concludes USSR Visit, Departs

#### Jaruzelski Notes 'Necessary' Visit

*LD1304175690 Warsaw Domestic Service in Polish 1700 GMT 13 Apr 90*

[Statement by Polish President Wojciech Jaruzelski to unidentified correspondent in Moscow on 13 April—recorded]

[Text] While holding various posts and at various times, I have had many opportunities to visit Moscow, to visit the Soviet Union, but I think that this visit is the most important of all the visits to date. I attach the greatest significance to it. This results both from the times in which we live and the spirit of those times, as well as from the substantive and, I would say, emotional content, which this visit brought. The substantive: contacts, talks—above all, the very long and interesting deep talks with Mikhail Gorbachev—were very long and interesting. Practically, they concerned all spheres of our mutual interest: the internal situation, the international situation, bilateral relations—political, economic, social. I'm convinced that this visit will be an important impetus for the development of those relations, built on a higher foundation, in accordance with the important declaration which we have just signed. I won't elaborate on this subject, for considerably more would have to be said.

I want to stress just one moment: Katyn. Today, in fact, a very extensive set of documents linked with that tragedy were definitively formulated and handed to me by Mikhail Gorbachev. I think that these documents will be an exceptionally valuable aid to historians, not to mention their immense value to the families, to the nearest and dearest of the murdered officers.

To sum up, a very important visit, a very necessary one, a very fruitful one. I am greatly pleased with it and I am convinced that it will be of great service to Poland.

### Discovery of Katyn Papers Noted

*LD1304131190 Moscow TASS in English 1255 GMT 13 Apr 90*

[Text] Moscow April 13 TASS—Follows an official TASS statement issued today:

"The need to elucidate the circumstances of the death of Polish officers interned in September, 1939 has long been raised at meetings between representatives of the Soviet and Polish leadership and in broad public circles.

"Historians of the two countries have conducted a careful investigation of the Katyn tragedy, including a search for documents.

"Just recently, Soviet archive workers and historians discovered some documents concerning Polish servicemen who were kept in the Kozelsk, Starobelsk and Ostashkov camps by the NKVD security police.

"It follows from these documents that in April-May 1940, 394 of the 15,000 or so Polish officers kept in the three camps were transferred to the Gryazovetsk camp. The larger part, however, were 'turned over to' the NKVD administrations in the Smolensk, Voroshilovgrad and Kalinin regions and never mentioned in NKVD statistical accounts since.

"The discovered archival material puts direct responsibility for the atrocities in the Katyn forest on Beria, Merkulov and their henchmen.

"The Soviet side, expressing profound regret over the Katyn tragedy, declares that this tragedy is one of the gravest crimes of Stalinism.

"Copies of the discovered documents have been passed over to the Polish side. The search for more archival material continues."

### Jaruzelski Receives NKVD Lists

*PM1504174990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian Second Edition 14 Apr 90 p 1*

[TASS report: "Polish President in Moscow"]

[Text] Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev met Wojciech Jaruzelski, president of the Republic of Poland, in the Kremlin 13 April. Jaruzelski is currently here on an official visit.

The two presidents discussed a wide range of questions on bilateral relations and international life within the context of major changes taking place in the two countries, Europe and the world as a whole.

Then the meeting was extended to include other officials. Participating in it on the Soviet side were Presidential Council Members Yu.D. Maslyukov, E.A. Shevardnadze, and D.T. Yazov and other officials; on the Polish side were J. Czyrek, J. Osiatynski, A. Drawicz, A. Gieysztor, B. Kulski, S. Ciosek, J. Onyskiewicz, and other officials accompanying the Polish president on his trip.

Later in the day Gorbachev and Jaruzelski signed a Soviet-Polish declaration.

Gorbachev gave Jaruzelski copies of lists and other materials, found recently by Soviet archivists and historians, from the former main department for prisoners of war and the interned of the NKVD (People's Commissariat for Foreign Affairs) of the USSR.

The copies contain the names of Polish citizens who were kept at the NKVD's camps in Kozelsk, Ostashkov and Starobelsk from 1939 to 1940.

### Gorbachev, Jaruzelski Talks Reported

*PM1604100390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian Second Edition 16 Apr 90 pp 1, 4*

[Unattributed report: "Talks in the Kremlin"]

[Text] M.S. Gorbachev, president of the USSR, met W. Jaruszelski, president of the Republic of Poland, who came to the Soviet Union on an official visit, in the Kremlin on 13 April. A frank and friendly exchange of opinions on topical issues of Soviet-Polish relations and pan-European and world politics took place.

Participants in the talks agreed about the fact that the process of good-neighborly relations and cooperation has vital significance for the peoples of the USSR and Poland. Under the conditions of the profound changes occurring in both countries, it is important to preserve and further develop all that is valuable in what has been achieved in Soviet-Polish relations during recent years based on full equality of rights, consistent respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of both states, mutual consideration for the interests of their peoples.

The heads of the two states stressed the importance and significance of extending Soviet-Polish links along parliamentary and governmental lines between state departments and public organizations and between figures from science and art.

The exchange of cultural values has always meant a great deal in the spiritual life of both countries, it was noted in the conversation, and perhaps nothing else as much promotes the deepening of feelings of mutual respect and friendship among the Polish and soviet peoples.

The significance of economic links and the commitment of both sides to their development were confirmed. At the same time, it was stressed that serious efforts must be made in the near future to provide for the transition of the entire cooperation mechanism from traditional, in many ways obsolete, methods and forms to new ways corresponding to contemporary world levels and the principles of the transformation of the economic systems carried out in the two countries. The extensive use of market mechanisms, direct links between enterprises, and the transition to the settlement of accounts in freely convertible currency on the basis of world prices in accordance with the decisions of the 45th CEMA session in Sofia will facilitate this.

In this connection, questions relating to the state of our reciprocal settlements and the procedure to eliminate Poland's foreign debt to the Soviet Union were dealt with. It was agreed that discussion of these questions be continued along government lines.

It will soon be 45 years since the victory over fascist Germany, a struggle in which our people suffered huge losses. This topic was also dealt with in the course of the conversation. W. Jaruzelski said that the Polish people revere the memory of the 600,000 Soviet soldiers who gave their lives for Poland's liberation.

The participants remarked on the particular moral importance of clarifying the circumstances around the death of Polish officers in the Koizelsk, Starobelsk, and Ostashkov camps.

Documents recently unearthed by Soviet historians provide grounds for concluding that the blame for this rests on Beriya and his henchmen. We profoundly commiserate with the Polish people, the kith and kin of those who perished, said M.S. Gorbachev. Soviet people were also wiped out there in Katyn, and that is our common tragedy.

In this connection, the participants in the conversation stressed the importance of completely rehabilitating Poles and Soviet people who fell victim to the Stalinist repressions.

The Polish side voiced its satisfaction with the Soviet side's desire to create conditions that will help Soviet citizens of Polish extraction preserve their original culture and language, and give them the opportunity to satisfy their religious needs and maintain ties with Poland.

The presidents of the USSR and the Republic of Poland exchanged opinions on very important aspects of international politics, devoting particular attention to the German issue. Nobody has any doubt on the right of the Germanys to unify, but this is a problem that affects more than just the two German states, and the solution to it must rule out hasty improvization. There must not be the slightest possibility of a repetition of the misfortunes which once engulfed Europe from German territory. All things considered, there is agreement in principle on this in both the East and in the West. However, there are differences of opinion on how to achieve this. The main thing is to ensure that the current turn of the German issue does not rock the European boat, and does not interrupt the positive processes that recently have been developing on the continent.

The USSR and Poland believe that, given a responsible and constructive approach by the interested parties, a solution acceptable to all can be found.

The reliable way to achieve this is the synchronization of the process of the unification of the two German states with the formation of new pan-European structures for security and cooperation. This, in its turn, requires guarantees of the immutability of the postwar borders existing in Europe, including the western and northern borders of Poland and the Soviet Union.

In this context, the presidents stressed the well-founded nature of Poland's position on the issue of concluding a Polish-German treaty confirming the finality of the border along the Odra and the Lusatian Nysa, and also of the participation of Poland in the "two plus four" talks, when issues of security, particularly borders, which are important for Poland, are discussed.

They advocated an acceleration of the pan-European rapprochement and expressed support for initiatives promoting institutionalization of the CSCE. The initiative of T. Mazowiecki, head of government of the Republic of Poland, concerning the formation of a council of European cooperation, is directed toward this.

The issue of the Soviet troop presence in Poland was touched on when European problems were discussed. M.S. Gorbachev recalled that the USSR has long advocated in principle the withdrawal of all foreign troops from the territory of European countries. As was already indicated in the Soviet Government statement of 12 February this year, we are ready to embark on talks on this issue.

Both presidents instructed the governments of their countries to draft an agreement which takes into consideration all external security aspects.

M.S. Gorbachev and W. Jaruzelski expressed the conviction that Soviet-Polish cooperation on a bilateral basis and within the framework of the Warsaw Pact may play an important role in the further development of the pan-European process.

Agreement was reached on the expediency of renewing the treaty basis [dogovornaya baza] of Soviet-Polish relations, taking account of the great changes going on in both allied states, in Europe and the world as a whole.

The talks were held in a constructive and friendly atmosphere. First of all, the presidents held a tete-a-tete, and then they were joined by E.A. Shevardnadze, Yu.D. Maslyukov, D.T. Yazov, V.M. Falin, N.N. Gubenko, G.I. Marchuk, M.F. Nenashev, G.L. Smirnov, and G.Kh. Shakhnazarov on the Soviet side; and by J. Czyrek, J. Osiatynski, A. Drawicz, A. Gieysztor, B. Kulski, J. Onyszkiewicz, W. Findeisen, S. Closek, K. Marszalek-Mlynczyk, F. Puchala, and J. Maciszewski on the Polish side.

J. Onyszkiewicz, Poland's deputy minster for national defense, said: The "Soldiarity" movement has always considered relations with the Soviet Union to be of the utmost importance. We are convinced that they should be founded on good-neighborly partnership. The process of democratization in our two countries is promoting the development of these relations. A historic chance has presented itself, and it is important not to miss it. In the words of A. Drawicz, chairman of the committee for

radio and television, the reform process begun by M.S. Gorbachev is very important to Poland. He stressed that the Polish public wishes the Soviet leadership and the entire people success in the further implementation of the ideas of perestroyka. A. Gieysztor, a great historian and president of the Polish Academy of Sciences, put foward a number of interesting thoughts relating to the significance of the exchange of cultural valuables. The report by USSR Culture Minister N.N. Gubenko, in which he spoke of the possibility of handing over to the Polish side a number of historical relics dating back to the 15th-17th centuries that are in the Hermitage, was in tune with this. Yu.D. Maslyukov spoke of the talks he had had with W. Osiatynski, head of the Republic of Poland's central planning office, in the course of which the conditions for economic cooperation in the coming years were examined.

The heads of the two states remarked with satisfaction on the fine crop of results from this visit, and voiced assurance that it will give fresh impetus to the development of all-round Soviet-Polish cooperation.

W. Jaruzelski invited M.S. Gorbachev to visit Poland, and the invitation was accepted with gratitude.

### Lukyanov Meets With Jaruzelski

*LD1304163490 Moscow TASS in English 1620 GMT 13 Apr 90*

[Text] Moscow April 13 TASS—Confidence in the importance of developing relations of goodneighbourliness and all-round cooperation between the Soviet Union and the Republic of Poland on the basis of keeping and multiplying everything valuable and mutually-beneficial that was achieved over the past 45 years was expressed during a meeting between Anatoliy I. Lukyanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and Wojciech Jaruzelski, president of the Republic of Poland, here today.

It was pointed out that new substance is now been added to Soviet-Polish relations and the development of interstate ties is becoming a priority.

The two sides declared in favor of further stimulating interparliamentary contacts and expressed their striving for close cooperation in the international arena, for the strengthening of European security, for broader cooperation and the building of confidence between all countries and peoples.

### Gorbachev Gives Dinner Speech

*PM1504175390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian Second Edition 14 Apr 90 p 5*

[TASS report: "For Good-Neighborly Partnership"]

[Text] At the Grand Kremlin Palace today a dinner was hosted by USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev and Raisa Gorbacheva in honor of President of the Republic of Poland Wojciech Jaruzelski and Barbara Jaruzelska.

Polish officials accompanying the guest on his trip were also present. On the Soviet side, those present included Mikhail Gorbachev, and his wife, members of the Presidential Council, and other officials.

Mikhail Gorbachev delivered a speech. He said:

Esteemed President Wojciech Jaruzelski!

Esteemed Pani Barbara Jaruzelski!

Esteemed Polish guests!

I am genuinely pleased to welcome you here to the Kremlin today. We have known one another a long time and have met many times. I believe that it can be said without exaggeration that each such meeting has given fresh impetus to the development of Soviet-Polish relations and to mutual understanding and cooperation between our countries and peoples. It would appear to be the case that today's exchange of views, too, has taken place in the spirit of that fine tradition.

The world has today entered a phase of mighty changes. The faces of our two countries are changing in a radical way. All of this could not fail but to mark a definite threshold in the development of Soviet-Polish relations too. At such moments it is especially important not to spill so much as a drop of the goodness that has been accumulated in those relations, and at the same time to pick up promptly and sensitively those new demands with which life confronts us.

In this connection the president and I have spoken of how important, but sometimes also how difficult, it is to overcome the habit of viewing new situations through yesterday's eyes.

It is no secret for us that there are forces in Poland who, to put it mildly, are not very well disposed to the Soviet Union. And I shall make no secret of the fact that in our country, too, there are people who view with suspicion everything that is happening now in Poland.

But the future does not belong to such people. The vital national interests of the Soviet Union and Poland are best served by a sincere desire to understand one another and by an attitude of respect for the choices made by the peoples of each country, which is the main route to further development of Soviet-Polish relations.

If you ask me how we would like to see these relations, the answer is short—good-neighborly, mutually beneficial, and based on genuine partnership.

And if you ask me what we would not like to see in these relations, I would say that we do not want even a suggestion of distrust, disrespect, or inability to listen to and understand one another.

Naturally, during the course of the visit we have also spoken about those historical "problems" which, even after many years, have been casting a shadow on our relations. Many of them have already been resolved.

Recently documents were found which indirectly but convincingly show that the thousands of Polish citizens who perished in the Smolensk forests exactly half-a-century ago were the victims of Beria and his cronies.

The graves of the Polish officers lie alongside those of Soviet people who perished at that same evil hand. It is difficult but necessary to talk about this tragedy since the path to genuine renewal and genuine mutual understanding lies only through the truth. And it is all the more important to do so in that the complex, centuries-old history of our relations clearly shows that on those occasions when historical destinies put our countries on opposite sides, both peoples suffered. This was particularly so on the eve of World War II.

But it is impossible to overestimate the significance of the fact that we found ourselves on the same side when that war ended and our soldiers advanced to Berlin and the Elbe together.

Our meeting is taking place on the eve of the 45th anniversary of the victory of the USSR, Poland, and other allied nations in World War ii. Today I would like to bow before the memory of Soviet and Polish servicemen who have made an enormous contribution to this overall victory, and to wish health to all those now living who participated in those heroic events, and who include our dear guest.

Of course, however solid the foundation of interstate relations may be, whatever weighty reasons for their development may be contained in the past, nevertheless the future of these relations depends to a decisive degree on mutual interest and good will of the sides concerned.

As a result of the substantive talks with the Polish president we have come to the agreement that both Moscow and Warsaw have that mutual commitment and that good will.

Now our countries are going through a stage of such deep changes, when literally every aspect of public life is being considered from a critical viewpoint. This applies to the sphere of economic cooperation, too. With very good reason we and our Polish partners point to the obsolete and anachronistic nature of many of the existing forms of economic links and their low efficiency.

All this is true. Much must be changed here and suitable approaches have surfaced. We have talked about this with Tadeusz Mazowiezki, the Polish prime minister, during his visit to the USSR.

At the same time, it would not be sensible to renounce something that has justified itself, taken root, and retains importance for both countries today, too.

This concerns a quite intense economic exchange in all spheres where our national economies might not compete but complement one another.

This, indisputably, concerns living and full-blooded links in the sphere of culture and science.

This can, with good reason, also be applied to our interaction in international affairs, where a coincidence of interests exists between the Soviet Union and Poland, above all in the matter of guaranteeing the security of our states, their territorial integrity, and the inviolability of their borders and a profound commitment to the preservation and consolidation of peace in Europe.

A new government has come to power in Poland, which is backed by different political tendencies than in the past and by different people. This is a matter of the sovereign choice of the Polish people. But whoever is responsible for foreign affairs in our country and in yours, in general outline, the foreign policies of our two countries, in my profound conviction, can and must actively interact.

In this spirit we exchanged views on topical problems of the situation in the world and, above all, in Europe.

Recently, the Helsinki process, which has had such a beneficial influence in changing the entire political climate of our continent, has emerged onto open ground and taken on new dimensions. But on this road there are still unresolved problems and concealed obstacles. It is extremely important, therefore, that the processes of renewal in individual European countries should not weaken but, on the contrary, strengthen stability throughout Europe. At first glance there would appear to be a contradiction between the concepts of stability and change. Yes, that is so if by change you mean chaotic and explosive processes, and by stability you mean stagnation. It is not so if one realizes that in the nuclear age the still fragile peace of Europe and its security require that every step by any state and any people be commensurate with the general balance of interests and require an immeasureably increased general responsibility for the future of our continent and the entire community of man.

I feel that in such conditions the cooperation of the USSR with Poland and the major countries of Eastern Europe is assuming particular importance.

Both our countries are interested in European security, in security in the broadest sense, including from the military-political, economic, humanitarian, and ecological viewpoints.

This naturally includes, too, a resolution of the German problem that would reliably guarantee the interests of all European countries. The peoples of the Soviet Union and Poland, who suffered very heavy losses as a result of the aggression of German fascism, are entitled to say: "An emphatic yes to a peaceful unified Germany in a peaceful united Europe; but equally a firm no to a Germany as a potential hotbed of danger in a disunited and split Europe".

Therefore, defining Germany's military-political status is of exceptionally great importance. In our view it will not be enough if it has commitments only to the United States and other NATO participants. Germany must

have commitments of a similar character also to the Soviet Union and the Eastern European countries.

As I understand it, our country and Poland have a united position on these issues, if one is speaking about the essence of the matter.

In general I am convinced that Soviet-Polish cooperation has a durable and objective basis that is not dependent on any fluctuations in the current situation, and therefore it has fine prospects. I find it particularly pleasant to state this in the presence of President Wojciech Jaruzelski.

I think that we are entitled to say that your visit has been successful and the joint declaration that we have signed will well serve the cause of further development of Soviet-Polish relations for the good of both of our countries and the good of European peace.

Accept, esteemed Mr President, you, Pani Barbara, and our Polish guests the most cordial wishes from the Soviet comrades present here.

Our sincere wishes for the success and well-being of the whole Polish people!

Wojciech Jaruszelski then made a speech.

The dinner passed in a friendly atmosphere.

### Jaruzelski Delivers Dinner Speech

*PM1504172190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Apr 90 Second Edition p 5*

[TASS-attributed version of speech delivered by Polish President Jaruzelski at 13 April Kremlin dinner hosted by Gorbachev under general heading "For Good-Neighborly Partnership": "W. Jaruzelski's Speech"]

[Text] Esteemed President,
Dear Mikhail Sergeyevich,
Esteemed Raisa Maksimovna,
Dear Soviet friends!

I thank you for the cordial, warm words addressed to our people and the Republic of Poland and for the hospitality extended to us on Ukrainian soil and here in Moscow, capital of the USSR.

Present-day history is seething like a river in flood. When I came to your country on an official visit three years ago, Poland was a different country, the Soviet Union was a different country, and it is possible to say that the world was different, too. It seems that a whole age has passed, yet it has only just begun.

I remember our meetings and prolonged talks well. We jointly reached the conclusion that life was calling for profound changes. We have now gained new experience. The greater the scale and depth of the transformations, the more difficult the problems they expose and the higher their cost. However, the price which would sooner or later have to be paid for turning away from reforms would be higher still.

We share the opinion that every individual, state, and people must have the right to organize their home as they themselves see fit. This is why certain decisions in our countries have much in common, but they also differ in many respects, being specific to each country. This is a consequence of both history and current conditions.

During the past year profound transformations have taken place in our country. We have embarked on the road of boldly resolving difficult political and socioeconomic problems. We will be put to difficult tests along this road more than once. The main thing is to ensure that the spirit of national accord and the understanding of the state's and nation's destiny prove stronger than contradictory interests, stronger than extremism and divisiveness.

This is why we follow the historic perestroyka process all the more closely. We are aware of its significance for the Soviet Union, Europe, and the world. Poland has a special reason to wish you success in this titanic venture both as your neighbor and as a country which has embarked on the path of reforms long ago.

Esteemed Mikhail Sergeyevich!

Soon we will be marking the 45th anniversary of the signing of the Polish-Soviet Treaty of Friendship. It was drawn up during a different historical period when the alignment of forces was different. At times the path of its implementation was thorny, and our feelings of national dignity and sovereignty were put to a severe test more than once.

But it was not an alliance which existed on paper only. For Poland it was above all a guarantee of its new, secure borders. Today it should reflect the shape of Polish-Soviet relations—equal relations based on the principle of respect for the partner, mutual advantage, and modern principles of economic cooperation.

The foundations of Polish policy do not change with a change of government. The unshakable truth remains that good-neighborly relations are equally needed by our countries and peoples. Sovereign, democratic Poland is and will remain a reliable partner and loyal ally. Graphic proof of this was the recent visit of the prime minister of the Republic of Poland.

The declaration which we have signed today is a continuation and development of the thinking on bilateral relations which we so vividly expressed three years ago. In adopting the memorable April declaration at the time, we sowed good seeds. This, too, cleared the path toward glasnost and truth. And only truth, even if it is a bitter truth, provides the basis for boundless, sincere friendship.

An assessment of centuries of living side by side is never monochrome. In our mutual history there is much that is

pure and sound. And the time has come to draw a line under the bad and black pages once and for all.

The Soviet side's statement concerning the Katyn atrocity is of particular importance and value for our people from the moral viewpoint. It has cleared the path toward finding out the truth about the tragic fate of Polish servicemen interned after 1939.

This was an unusually painful issue for us. However, no reasonable Pole will ever blame the Soviet people for Katyn, Kuropaty, Lubyanka, or Kolyma, since they were the first victim of the Stalinist mass repressions.

To put it succinctly, 17 September was a trauma for the Polish people, but six years later, 9 May, we were together in Berlin.

In this context allow me to share a personal reminiscence with you. As one of the hundreds of thousands of Poles sent into exile in Siberia I personally experienced the lawlessness of Stalinism in my own fate and the fate of my family. What I have drawn from these grim years and the subsequent joint march through battlefields is respect for the humanity, patriotism, staunchness, and self-sacrifice of your people, not hostility.

And so, without covering up the tragic pages of the past, let us look ahead and start building the future.

Esteemed Soviet friends!

We live at a crucial time in modern history. The philosophy and practice of international relations are changing. The new thinking which you, Mikhail Sergeyevich, have initiated, and the constructive Soviet-U.S. dialogue are already bearing fruit in the shape of profound transformations on a European and global scale. The idea of the "common European home," the concept of a European confederation, the proposal to set up a European cooperation council—all these are important initiatives which coincide in many respects.

Europe, which until recently was the main sphere of confrontation, is turning into a laboratory for developing consensus and rapprochement. We are pinning great hopes on your idea of holding a summit of CSCE states and on the Helsinki-2 conference. The chance is emerging to turn our continent into one big family of states and peoples. However, there are also misgivings. The transformations which are taking place must not be allowed to undermine the feeling of security, stability, and equilibrium.

In this context the establishment of a united Germany at the very heart of Europe takes on a special significance. The Polish people are closely following the evolution of the German question. This is a lesson which we have learned from history and which we have not forgotten. Our joint stance is expressed in the declaration which we have adopted today. It is a good thing that on such a vitally important question for our people we have always been and remain united.

Collective security must be the cause and destiny of the whole of Europe in the broad sense of the word. It cannot end on the Elbe or the Bug. There is only one Europe and it belongs to all of us. It is the Europe which gave the world Tolstoy and Hugo, Goethe and Pushkin, Byron and Mickiewicz. The prevailing dangers and opportunities apply to it as a whole. Today it is a matter of maintaining and augmenting values which have been jointly created on our continent over the centuries, strengthening mutual trust, and developing peaceful, creative labor.

Dear Mikhail Sergeyevich!

We have had friendly, substantive talks. As always, they were characterized by sincerity and mutual understanding. I highly appreciate your cordial attitude toward Poland. I am convinced that the current visit will serve well the friendship and cooperation between our countries and peoples.

Allow me to propose a toast:

To the health of President Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev of the USSR!

To your health, esteemed Raisa Maksimovna!

To the health of all our Soviet friends!

### Jaruzelski Arrives in Katyn

*LD1404204690 Warsaw PAP in English 1940 GMT 14 Apr 90*

[Text] Smolensk, April 14—As already reported, President Jaruzelski of Poland wound up his official visit in the USSR tonight. He went to Katyn straight from the ceremony of bidding him farewell by M. Gorbachev, held at the Kremlin.

A wooden cross was put up on the site of the Katyn crime. This cross had been consecrated by Poland's Primate Cardinal Jozef Glemp. There is a wall before the cross, carrying an inscription in Russian: To Polish officers who perished at Katyn. Over a dozen days or so [ago] the inscription in Polish, saying that the crimes on Polish officers had been committed by the Nazis, disappeared. Unfortunately. There is no caption now reporting on the NKVD's [KGB predecessor] responsibility for the Katyn tragedy instead.

President Jaruzelski, clad in a general's uniform for the occasion, laid a white-and-red carnation wreath upon the symbolic grave slab. The Polish Army's guard of honour and the Soviet Army's guard of honour presented arms.

The president made the following entry in the visitor's book: They were fighting for a free Poland, perished innocent, far removed from families and homeland, being faithful to Poland and soldierly honour till they breathed their last. To Polish officers, to the victims of the atrocious Stalinist crime in tribute and unpassing memory.

A roll call of the dead was read. The general dean of the Polish Army Florian Klewiado said a mass for those murdered at Katyn. Military salute and Chopin's mourning march followed.

The truth about Katyn, said Jaruzelski to journalists, has been uttered. And the truth heals the wounds. I think we will feel better now. We will understand each other better.

The president also laid a wreath at an obelisk in the Katyn forest commemorating the death of Soviet POW's murdered by the Nazi's in 1942.

### PRAVDA on Jaruzelski's Katyn Visit

*PM1604141990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Apr 90 Second Edition p 4*

[TASS report: "Touring the Country"]

[Text] W. Jaruzelski, president of the Republic of Poland, arrived in Smolensk 14 April. He visited the site of the Katyn tragedy and laid a wreath at the memorial to the dead Polish officers. The ceremony included military honors paid by the Polish and Soviet sides.

A wreath was also laid at the obelisk commemorating Soviet soldiers who died in the Smolensk region.

The visitor laid a wreath at the Eternal Flame of Glory at the Heroes' Memory Park in the center of Smolensk.

White and red carnations from the president of the Republic of Poland were also laid at the burial grounds of Soviet and Polish soldiers in Lenino Village, on the territory of neighboring Mogilev Oblast in Belorussia, where the Kosciuszko division underwent its baptism of fire during the war. W. Jaruzelski visited the local museum of Soviet-Polish comradeship-in-arms.

W. Jaruzelski, president of the Republic of Poland, said in an interview with journalists:

"The visit was very important for me. Profoundly meaningful and very emotional. I had interesting meetings in the Ukraine, in Kiev and Lvov, and mainly in Moscow with M.S. Gorbachev, other Soviet leaders, and representatives of the Soviet parliament and science. These were very important conversations. They will promote our good relations, our friendship and cooperation, which is especially important at the present historical period, when profound transformations are taking place in our countries. I was profoundly impressed today. We paid our respect to the victims of Stalinist terror, the Polish officers who died in Katyn. The truth about what happened here has been told. And the truth heals wounds. It will be easier for us to understand one another. We also paid our respect to the remains of Soviet people. Lenino is a very important place in the history of our armed forces, of our war of liberation, of our friendship-in-arms. I am very pleased that our visit ended here. I am convinced that it will further our friendship, our good neighborly relations."

On his return to Smolensk, Poland's president met the oblast and city leadership. That concluded the program of the visit to the USSR.

W. Jaruzelski departed for home in the evening.

### Jaruzelski Visits Belorussia

*LD1404162890 Moscow TASS in English 1551 GMT 14 Apr 90*

[Text] Mogilev April 14 TASS—President Wojciech Jaruzelski of Poland, staying in the Soviet Union at the invitation of President Mikhail Gorbachev, visits Belorussia.

Today Jaruzelski visited the settlement of Lenino near which the first Polish Tadeusz Kosciuszko infantry division, formed on Soviet territory, fought its first battle against Fascist invaders on October 12, 1943.

This day is now celebrated as the day of Polish People's Army foundation. A memorial complex and a museum of the Soviet-Polish brotherhood in arms have been founded here, in Lenino.

Jaruzelski and officials accompanying him visited the museum. The president made an entry in the honorary visitors' book. Wreaths were laid to Soviet and Polish soldiers' graves. Polish, Soviet and Belorussian national anthems were performed. A handful of earth from the battlefield was presented to the president.

In the evening, Jaruzelski departed from Lenino.

### Jaruzelski Ends Official Visit

*LD1404072290 Moscow TASS in English 0713 GMT 14 Apr 90*

[Text] Moscow April 14 TASS—The official part of Polish President Wojciech Jaruzelski's visit to the Soviet Union at the invitation of President Mikhail Gorbachev ended in the morning today.

Gorbachev and his wife warmly parted with Jaruzelski and his wife at the Grand Kremlin Palace.

The motorcade, escorted by motorcyclists, left the Kremlin for the airport.

### Lukyanov Sees Off Jaruzelski

*LD1404105690 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0727 GMT 14 Apr 90*

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] The state flags of Poland and the Soviet Union were flying at Vnukovo Airport. A guard of honor representing the three services of the Soviet Armed Forces—the Army, Navy, and Air Force—was drawn up on the tarmac. The band played the two countries' national anthems. A.I. Lukyanov, the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and W. Jaruzelski inspected the guard of honor. The ceremony ended with a march-past by the guard of honor. The president of the Republic of Poland left for Smolensk.

### Jaruzelski Returns Home From USSR

*LD1404215590 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1952 GMT 14 Apr 90*

[Text] Warsaw, 14 Apr (TASS)—The president of the Republic of Poland, Wojciech Jaruzelski, today returned to Warsaw after completing his official visit to the Soviet Union. He was met at the airport by Marshal of the Senate Andrzej Stelmachowski and members of the country's government. Also among those meeting him was the USSR ambassador to Poland, Vladimir Brovikov.

### TASS Cites Poland's Jaruzelski Upon Return

*LD1504015990 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0115 GMT 15 Apr 90*

[Text] Warsaw, 15 Apr (TASS)—Having ended a four-day official visit to the Soviet Union, Wojciech Jaruzelski, president of the Republic of Poland, characterized it as rich in content and emotions, as was illustrated by the itinerary of his visit—Lvov, Kiev, Moscow, Katyn, Lenino. On Saturday he spoke to journalists on his return to Warsaw. The visit was unique because it took place in a period crucial for both Poland and the Soviet Union, W. Jaruzelski continued. It gave specific results which have been reflected in the joint declaration.

The meeting with Mikhail Gorbachev was a normal step along the path of exchanging experiences and of complete mutual understanding in all basic issues, the Polish President stressed. The Soviet leader shows great goodwill toward Poland and in interest in our experiences and solutions for problems. A complete coincidence of opinion was noted in regard to the German issue.

The i's have been dotted regarding the Katyn question, W. Jaruzelski continued. A statement has been made on who bears responsibility for this crime: It is borne by the Soviet authorities at that time. This admission was an extremely important issue for Poland. M.S. Gorbachev gave me a large amount of materials and documents connected to this matter which it will be possible to study. At the same time, further work and investigations in the archives will be continued. The basic problem, however, has been cleared up. Now it will be possible to determine the other burial places of camp inmates in Ostashkov and Starobelsk [in Polish, Ostaszkow and Starobielsk], the president of the Polish Republic said.

### Text of Soviet-Polish Declaration Published

*LD1404130290 Moscow TASS in English 1115 GMT 14 Apr 90*

[Text] Moscow, 14 Apr (TASS)—The text of a Soviet-Polish declaration has been published here today. The text follows:

M.S. Gorbachev, president of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and W. Jaruzelski, president of the Republic of Poland, declare:

1. That the good-neighborly relations and mutually advantageous cooperation between the Soviet Union and Poland, corresponding to their national interests, are of fundamental importance for both states and are a substantial factor assisting stabilization and the strengthening of peace in Europe.

2. That the consistent mutual respect for equality of rights, sovereignty, territorial integrity, nonintervention in internal affairs, freedom of sociopolitical choice, and other universally accepted international principles and norms contained in the UN Charter and the final act of the CSCE are the reliable foundation of Soviet-Polish relations.

3. That the profound democratic changes in the Soviet Union and Poland, despite all their differences, are broadening the social basis of mutual relations. The new conditions demand the renewal of the forms and content of the Soviet-Polish ties that have been formed. The heads of state consider it important that this process, which has been objectively building up, should be based on a carefully regulated balance of interests.

4. That the Soviet Union and the Republic of Poland need an increase in the effectiveness of reciprocal economic cooperation.

A transition, based on agreement between the sides, to the settlement of accounts in freely convertible currency on the basis of world prices and the utilization of market mechanisms must be a major step on this path.

5. The Soviet and Polish authorities will create the most favorable conditions for communication between Soviet and Polish citizens and for the provision of the public with objective information about the developments in both countries. The sides consider that national and ethnic groups living on the territory of each country and the churches could play a positive role in bringing the peoples of the two countries together.

It is important to complete work on re-establishing the historical truth about difficult moments in Russian-Polish and Soviet-Polish relations and to facilitate in every way the development of constructive Soviet-Polish dialogue at all levels, with the broad participation of representatives of public opinion, science, and culture.

6. Positively assessing the importance of the Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation, and Mutual Assistance between the Soviet Union and Poland, and taking into account the radical changes in their life, as well as the current processes in Europe and the world, the sides intend to develop their relations on new principles in accordance with this declaration. Existing treaties and agreements will remain in force.

7. The Soviet Union and Poland will promote the transformation of the present military-political alliances into a qualitatively new non-bloc system of reliable, collective security in Europe which stands outside blocs.

Unless new European security structures are created, the Warsaw Treaty remains an important factor for peace and stability in Europe.

8. While fully recognising the right of the German people to self-determination, the Soviet Union and Poland are united in the view that the process of the unification of Germany must be synchronized with the general European process; reliably take account of the vital security interests of the USSR, Poland, and other countries; and insure firm guarantees of the inviolability of Poland's present Western border and all post-war borders that have taken shape in Europe, and their consolidation in international law.

9. The heads of state declare that the Soviet Union and the Republic of Poland will consistently advocate the total exclusion of force from the practice of international relations, their democratization and humanization, and the establishment in them of the primacy of international law and the supremacy of general human values and interests.

[Signed] M.S. Gorbachev, W. Jaruzelski

### Commentary Views Katyn Events, Documents

*LD1304195490 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 13 Ap 90*

[Commentary by A.O. Chubaryan, director of the General History Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] In 1943 in the forest at Katyn near Smolensk, the Germans discovered the graves of Polish officers. They set up a commission, which included representatives of the International and Polish Red Cross—they even brought in two professors from Warsaw—who stated that the Polish officers were shot before the war in 1940 by the NKVD [People's Commissariat of Internal Affairs].

About a year after that event, when the area had been liberated by the Soviet Army, a Soviet extraordinary commission was set up under academician Burdenko. The commission published its conclusion, which was that the Polish officers—there was no doubt about them having been found there—had been shot by the Germans, and that the Germans, to conceal their crime, had put forward the other version. So immediately after the war, the two versions came into conflict. Quite by accident, in an archive—an archive of the transport troops, as far as I'm aware—in which no one worked, a whole file, a whole dossier of documents was discovered. This happened literally just over a month ago, when they discovered the whole dossier concerning the transportation of the Polish officers from the camp were they had been. This contains detailed information on how they were loaded and transported, with lists of the names of the persons, Poles and escorts. And so now, on the basis of these documents, it has become plain that indeed, in the spring of 1940, in April, those Polish officers, just over 15,000 of them approximately, were taken from the camps where they were, mainly from three large camps.

These documents do not wrap things up completely. They bring us to the line beyond which is that terrible solution to the riddle. But if you bear in mind that after that, the correspondence ceased; if you bear in mind that, as is already evident from the documents which have been found, all the files on those officers were immediately destroyed, then one can conclude that the version that existed and that has been actively studied by our Polish colleagues is confirmed. Documents have been found on which you can actually see the signatures of Beria and his deputies which sealed the fate of those Polish officers. Now we must search the archives further, perhaps even the same archives, and I can assure you that as far as I know, our historians are fully determined, as it were, to continue this work. And I think we must do this in collaboration with the Poles.

### FRG President Discusses German Reunification

*LD1604121990 Moscow TASS in English 1229 GMT 16 Apr 90*

[Text] Bonn April 16 TASS—"The process of German reunification should not engender any fears. A future Germany will not pose any threat to its neighbours," President Richard von Weizsaecker of West Germany said in an interview with the ARD Television Network.

"The European countries," he noted, "are now confronted with difficult issues that cannot be solved by one nation. The main problem is that of the environment, which calls for joint actions. It depends on us all what we leave to coming generations. This is why it is necessary to promptly do away with weapons of mass destruction and go over to close cooperation in economy, culture and other areas."

Von Weizsaecker objected to a neutral united Germany. "I proceed from the premise," he said, "that the North Atlantic Alliance will eventually turn into a part of the European collective security system". According to Von Weizsaecker, the process of German reunification offers a unique chance to alter the military-political structures now existing in Europe.

### Ryzhkov Congratulates GDR's De Maiziere

*LD1604121990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 Apr 90 Morning Edition p 4*

[N.I. Ryzhkov Message of Congratulations to GDR Counterpart de Maiziere]

[Text] To Mr. Lothar de Maiziere, chairman of the GDR Council of Ministers

Accept our sincere congratulations on your election as chairman of the GDR Council of Ministers.

The Soviet Union is ready for broad collaboration with the government which you are heading in the interests of

maintaining and developing friendly cooperation between our countries based on the principles of equality, respect for sovereignty, and mutual advantage, and in the cause of creating new security structures and strengthening peace and stability in Europe.

I wish you success in your high post.

N. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers

## MSZP Leader Interviewed on Opposition Role

*PM1504135590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 12 Apr 90 Morning Edition p 4*

["IZVESTIYA Interview" in Budapest with MSZP Chairman Rezso Nyers by own correspondent F. Lukyanov: "R. Nyers: 'MSZP Is Going Into Opposition With Head Held High'"—date of interview not given; first paragraph is introduction]

[Text] The international press center in Budapest, where hundreds of foreign correspondents had worked during the elections, was the venue for journalists' meetings with the leadership of the main Hungarian political parties once the results had been summed up. This is also where I interviewed Rezso Nyers, deputy in the new State Assembly and chairman of the MSZP [Hungarian Socialist Party], which was until recently the ruling party but now, after the elections, has taken its place on the opposition benches.

[Nyers] I would not describe the results of the current parliamentary elections as a defeat for the MSZP, especially as, being realists, we did not expect a victory. For a young, virtually newly formed party which had six months to establish itself in the political arena, 530,000 votes are a substantial number, especially when you consider the conditions in which the election campaign had to be waged. I am referring above all to the severe pressure from practically all the opposition parties and the frequently incorrect attitude toward the MSZP and its candidates. In virtually all the constituencies where our candidates did quite well in the first round—featuring among the top three—they had to face a united opposition in the second round...

However, despite all the attempts, it did not prove possible to exclude the MSZP from parliament, and even if we have not won, we are nonetheless Hungarian society's leading left-wing force and we are taking our place in the opposition with our head held high...

I interpret the election results as a vote against the economic crisis for which the former MSZMP [Hungarian Socialist Workers Party] was responsible. Frequent attempts have been made to shift this responsibility onto the MSZP.

In any case we believe that it will be possible to considerably augment the 11 percent vote won by the MSZP under the party list system and that the parties which now have the advantage now will have to fight hard to hold on to it, which will not be easy in the current complex economic conditions. We know this well from our own experience.

[Lukyanov] Do you not regard it as paradoxical that, while, according to some public opinion polls, the social democratic idea is the most popular concept in Hungary (it has the support of around 50 percent of those polled), the Social Democrats and Socialists did not manage to win a majority at the elections? Could it be that the election results were affected by the fragmentation of the country's left-wing forces? How, in general, do you assess the state of the left-wing forces in Hungary and the prospects for their future cooperation?

[Nyers] Hungary's left-wing forces—the MSZP, the MSZMP, the Agrarian Union, and the Patriotic Election Coalition, the two social democratic parties, the trade unions, and the cooperative movement—are indeed disunited. On the other hand, their unification in any kind of coalition during the last election was impossible. Nonetheless, I cannot rule out the formation of some kind of alliance in the future with regard to the government's activities. I believe that by the next elections not just the MSZP but all the left-wing forces will be considerably stronger, especially as their social base remains relatively broad. They command around 30 percent of potential voters, plus another 30 percent who vote for the left-wing forces when the economic situation is relatively favorable.

An extraordinary MSZP Congress will be held at the end of May at which the problems confronting the party will be examined and analyzed. I think that changes in the leading organs will be implemented at the congress, after all, the elections have brought forward many young people who can and must reinforce the party leadership.

While the former program, which was adopted at the congress in October of last year, was drawn up for a ruling party, the platform which is about to be adopted will be one of a party in opposition. Certain changes will also be made to the party statutes. For instance, the MSZP parliamentary party will be given full autonomy and will be able to act independently of the party leadership, as is the custom in European socialist and social democratic parties.

[Lukyanov] Judging by appearances, a new stage in the history of your party is beginning—its activity in opposition. With what feelings is the party entering this new stage? What will be the policy and the first steps of your parliamentary party and what, in your opinion, will be the main goal of the MSZP's activity in the new conditions?

[Nyers] Our feelings are very mixed. We are totally unfamiliar with the opposition role, we have yet to master it. Unquestionably, our main task will be to protect the social rights of the Hungarian citizens, and in this respect we will have not only to reflect our party's policy but also express the interests of other left-wing forces which have not managed to get into parliament,

we will have to constantly seek points of contact with them, which may ultimately lead to an alliance.

I believe that the opposition—the MSZP and the Alliance of Free Democrats—will be able to exert different kinds of influence on the government, the Free Democrats in favor of the development of market relations and we in favor of social guarantees for people, thereby balancing each other, as it were. Naturally, the solution of economic problems will be the main task of both the future government and the parliament. However, we believe that social rights and social guarantees must not be sacrificed to the solution, for instance, of the foreign debt problem, and we will fight to ensure this.

Our approaches to questions of foreign policy may differ slightly from those of the government. We intend to uphold not just the trend toward closer ties with Europe, cooperation with the European Community, and a "return into the European fold," but also a more global approach, so to speak. We continue to regard the development of equal relations with the Soviet Union as being of vital importance for Hungary.

## Anticommunist Right Wing in Romania Criticized

*PM1204163190 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 10 Apr 90 Second Edition p 3*

[Dispatch by APN correspondent V. Samoshkin "for SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA": "Whither the Country: The Vicissitudes of the Election Contest in Romania"]

[Text] Bucharest—The choice of the path of democratic development is the key question of present-day political life in Romania. The struggle among the political parties and tendencies is developing around this question, and it will also be the basic one in the election campaign that is now under way. The country's inhabitants have to decide whether Romania will have a "European-type" democracy, "original national" democracy or "socialism with a human face," or "neocommunism," as perestroyka is called here.

It is interesting that the advocates of the latter say almost nothing openly, while its fierce opponents are becoming all the more active, even aggressive. One only has to recall the rallies and demonstrations organized by the so-called "historical parties," certain informal associations, and some students. Slogans such as "Down with communism!", "Restructuring won't save you, communism!" and "We don't want socialism with a human face!" can be seen and heard at those demonstrations. The following statement by R. Campeanu, chairman of one of the "historical parties"—the National Liberal Party—is typical. He announced his decision to run for the post of president in these terms: "Marxist ideology was a cancerous tumor on Romanian society. In today's conditions this ideology cannot be justified. Communism with a human face does not exist."

Here one has to amplify. In principle our perestroyka and the actual personality of M.S. Gorbachev enjoy wide popularity and respect. Everyone, or almost everyone, appreciates that the present changes in Eastern Europe, including Romania, would be impossible without the reforms in the USSR. I have heard many people say this, and not just once. But on the other hand, the uniqueness of the Romanian revolution, which overnight smashed all the Stalinist-type party and state structures, inspired the hope in society that very rapid progress toward democracy is possible. And given this, many people do find the pace of restructuring in Romanian conditions wanting.

The right-wing forces, which are spearheaded by the "historical parties," dismiss the idea of communism out of hand. The so-called Timisoara Proclamation of 11 March, which was put forward by a number of Timisoara public organizations and which has received the support of certain political parties and associations in the country, encapsulates these anticommunist sentiments in concentrated form. It has recently become the rallying point for the unification of right-wing forces in their struggle against the National Salvation Front, I. Iliescu—chairman of the Provisional Council for National Accord—and the government.

The main thesis of the document is as follows: "The Timisoara revolution was directed not just against Ceausescu but was unreservedly anticommunist." The proclamation denies the Romanian Communist Party's right to exist "under whatever name it may be reborn." But point no. 7 sounds like a direct challenge to the leaders of the National Salvation Front: "Timisoara began the revolution against the entire communist regime and its entire nomenklatura, but in no way so as to provide the anti-Ceausescu group of dissents from among the ranks of the RCP with an opportunity for political ascendancy. Their participation in the country's leadership would meran that the death of the heroes of Timisoara was in vain."

Was the December revolution indeed directed not just against Ceausescu but against "communism in general"—as a system and as an ideology? In my view there is a fairly substantial strained interpretation here. It is the accepted thing here now to speak "the truth about the Romanian revolution." As a direct eyewitness of the events, I believe that I have a moral right to voice my opinion on this score, too. I do not know about Timisoara, but in Bucharest neither on 21 December—and I spent the entire day on University Square right through to 2300 hrs—nor on the following day, 22 December, did I see or hear a single anticommunist slogan. The large red letters saying "Down with Communism!" on the building of the Hotel Intercontinental where most of the Westerners were staying, appeared later.

Of course, there was a certain "anticommunist charge" in the revolution if, by communism, one understands the Ceausescu dictatorship. But this concept, this identification in the masses' consciousness existed and does exist. And the right-wing extremist forces took advantage of this in their attempts to impart an anticommunist thrust

to the revolution. Their first appearance in the foreground occured 12 January. That unbridled demonstration on Victory Square in front of the National Salvation Front building left an unpleasant sensation in the hearts of millions of Romanians. Anticommunist slogans alternated with slogans against the National Salvation Front Council and its leaders which proved once again that the Front's platform (and it was the platform of the Romanian revolution backed by national accord) was not at all anticommunist.

At the same time, the champions of "true democracy" displayed quite an original understanding of this democracy: the right to hold rallies and to issue accusations was reserved by them for themselves only. But workers, miners had only to come out in a counterdemonstration in order to voice their concept of revolution, their attitude to the front and to Iliescu, and what a din would arise from the right and the workers and miners would be accused of all kinds of things by the "democrats" in their newspapers!

In this connection I recall certain details of the Romanian revolution. On the evening of 21 December when the general tension and alarm was growing on University Square, when the organs of repression now sent armored personnel carriers at high speed against the demonstrators, now fire trucks to drench them from water cannon, while salvoes of tracer bullets whistled increasingly frequently over the heads of the assembled crowds, the words "the workers are coming!" sounded over the throng like a sigh of relief and hope. On trucks and dumptrucks young working lads drove in buoyant mood to the square in order to create a barricade there with their trucks. On the morning of 22 December after the nighttime shooting when people began to drift toward the square once again it was the mighty columns of workers from the capital's enterprises who sealed the fate of the revolution: Only then did the army go over to the side of the people and then the entire people fearlessly poured out onto the streets. New articles in the press show that those "daredevils" who on 21 December during the official meeting had been the first to start chanting "Down with Ceausescu!" were in fact young workers from the Turbomecanica plant.

The workers said their bit for the revolution and will surely have something to say at the forthcoming elections. This is a serious political reality. Another such reality, closely linked with it, is the former members of the RCP. Yes, the RCP which was "confiscated" by the Ceausescu dictatorship, died its own death during the revolution. But the party is one thing; the former members, the majority of them honest, totally unblemished people, are quite another. This is what Ion Iliescu said recently on this topic: "The reaction of many people to the old regime is logical. People try to identify the entire evil of the old regime with the members of the Communist Party. However, this could develop into a dangerous witchhunt. If one considers the almost 4 million party members and if one adds to them the members of their families too, then we are talking about half the population of the country. If you also add the members of youth organizations it emerges that the majority of the country's population would be linked with communism. Amonmg those people who sacrificied their blood for the sake of the revolution there are many people who were party members."

And this, too, is the truth about the revolution, about which, unfortunately, little has been written and little has been spoken. And it also modifies the concept of the "anticommunist nature" of the December revolution.

The adherents of this concept also try to substantiate it from the national-historic viewpoint. Thus it is asserted, for example, that communism has been alien, ab initio, to the Romanian nation. "The Romanian people are not communist," writes the newspaper GLASUL. "Moreover, they have always been anticommunist." In this sense the entire path of Romania's development since 1945 is negated as a historically erroneous path imposed upon the country with the aid of "Russian tanks." But there is, all the same, a "tremendous distance between the Russian tanks" and the Ceausescu dictatorship. And there are nuances here which the Romanian press is beginning to analyze.

Talking of the Ceausescu phenomenon" for instance, the magazine ALTERNATIVE writes: "The most important thing at the present time which we have to explain to ourselves is: How did it become possible that there appeared among us, without any outside intervention, (if we are to use that favorite expression of the dictator) that kind of political penomenon which was uniquely monstrous. Soviet troops left the country in 1958. In April 1964 the RCP offically enshrined the line which hitherto had been more or less irresolute, of independence from Moscow. From then on the RCP leadership which is incorrectly confused with the leadership of Romania, was in fact independent... The system became... autonomous, and we ourselves could have somewhat improved it... We let that opportunity slip by."

Those are the subtleties. But it clearly does not suit the right-wing forces to delve into them. They find it more profitable to mix Ceausescu-ism, and Marxism, and Leninism, and socialism with a human face all together into a single heap with Stalinism and to serve all this up disguised as communism. And to try to achieve their own political aims at the same time.

Although it is unpopular in Romanian today to speak about socialist values, there are plenty of people here who do not intend to abandon their Marxist convictions. Their credo was expressed by the journalist Lorian Copca on the pages of the newspaper (NULINA) which is published in the city of Turnu-Severin: "We are full of hatred. Bestial hatred. We are confusing Ceausescu-ism and socialism, and that is a mistake. We think that everything in the West is ideal. But that is a delusion. The salvation of our national essence has to be sought in

that same socialism. The socialist idea has now been liberated, as one Soviet political scientist said, from utopia and fantasy."

**Slovak Leader on Problems Facing Communist Party**

*PM1104112190 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 8 Apr 90 Second Edition p 5*

[TASS correspondent A. Shapovalov dispatch: "'We Have Chosen the Path of Struggle.' Slovak Communists on Problems of Restoring Confidence in Party"]

[Text] Prague—Rallies, assemblies, and meetings attended by leaders of the republic Communist Party are taking place in Slovak cities and villages virtually every day. The aim of these events is to consolidate the population.

We must realize, P. Weiss, chairman of the Slovak Communist Party [CPSL] Central Committee Executive Committee, has said to the inhabitants of Stara Lubovna and Nova Ves, that we are no longer the leading party. We no longer control television and radio nor the powerful state apparatus. We have become just one of many political forces in the country. Our party activities must remain within the confines of political culture and tact and take account of the nuances of the emergent political system. However, this does not in the least mean that we can cede our positions or tolerate discrimination against Communists. It is the duty of every party member honorably to seek to regain the lost confidence in the party.

An upsurge of political activity is noticeable in Bratislava. A heated debate has broken out around the question of the future of the V.I. Lenin Museum. Opponents of Marxism-Leninism have argued that the museum should be closed. On Communists' initiative a mass rally was organized where the public demand to preserve the museum rang out clearly. "Lenin memorials exist in Britain, Switzerland, Sweden, and Finland, so why should they be the target of sacrilege in our country?" It was decided to retain the V.I. Lenin Museum and open an adjoining club, art gallery, and assembly hall.

Although subjected to all manner of hostile attacks, the Communist Party has no intention of leaving the political arena. On the contrary, the CPSL intends to regain its lost positions. This has been emphasized by PRAVDA, the newspaper of the CPSL.

Your TASS correspondent visited the PRAVDA Editorial Office and talked to many of its staffers. What has happened to the CPSL and within the CPSL is the same that has happened in the Czechoslovak Communist Party as a whole, the journalists said. Many people still do not understand why positions were ceded so quickly. In November of last year the Communist Party leadership was confronted with the dilemna: either to change everything, or to change nothing. They chose the first option because the second could have led to events resembling those in Romania. Now the party is in opposition. The situation will become increasingly complex. Possibly the most conservative regime in Europe is currently being set up in our country. It is only at first glance that Civic Forum—and this also applies to those currently in power—seems to be making mistakes. In reality everything is cleverly and subtly worked out. It can be claimed right now, without hesitation, that the course set is that of the restoration of capitalism. Society is in for more than one shock, more than one disillusionment.

Western propaganda has done its job. We have lost the young generation, my interlocutors stressed. No slogans will win it back for our ideology. The young ones will begin to see the light only when the new power has established itself, when society begins to divide up into different strata, when unemployment rears its head, and when instead of thinking about discotheques they will have to start thinking about finding jobs. Only then will young people remember the Communists.

If the Communist Party is weak, it will be preserved as a museum piece, as proof of the fact that all is well with pluralism in Czechoslovakia. If the Communists are strong, they will be combated. We have chosen the second path.

Instances of Communists being removed from leading posts have multiplied. PRAVDA has published an article under the headline "New Monopoly Taking Shape?" It emphasized: "We have seen the results of a monopoly of power, and we have learned our lesson from them. Therefore we will struggle against anybody who seeks a monopoly of power."

It has become customary to glorify the first president of Czechoslovakia, T. Masaryk. We must guard against unobjective assessements of history and demagogical statements, PRAVDA points out in this context. The newspaper has prepared a roundup of letters from readers who remember what life was like in Slovakia under Masaryk. People have not forgotten that under the much-praised president there were a million unemployed in the country, mainly Slovaks. All leading posts were occupied essentially by Czechs. Slovak emigration from the country became commonplace, and striking workers were simply fired at. A colonial policy was implemented in respect of Slovakia. Such was T.G. Masaryk's democracy.

Right now it is obvious that, having come to power, the opposition has been acting and continues to act in accordance with a precisely conceived and profoundly considered scenario.

Elements of psychological pressure predominate in its program. Its tactics are also worth a closer look. Civic Forum, acting to all intents and purposes as a party, engages in criticism of the government, claiming this to be a sign of courage and democracy. In reality the persecution of the CPCZ continues. Civic Forum finds

fault with the government because it includes Communists. At the same time, Civic Forum claims: We are not a party—thus placing itself beyond criticism.

At a time when it is necessary to act, there is a danger of getting bogged down in self-flagellation which will, inevitably, lead to self-liquidation. The ranks of the republic Communist Party organization which once comprised 460,000 members continue to dwindle. Organizational perestroyka is needed. Party organizations at enterprises have been disbanded, but the desire to unite remains. Party members now frequently gather beyond the factory gate rather than on enterprise territory. Debating clubs are being set up. It is necessary to join in the work of these horizontal structures and to coordinate their activities. People who know how to wage a real political struggle are still recovering from the shock. These are the realities. Analyzing them, some people are prone to believe that the Communists have abdicated from the struggle. In actual fact this is not so.

The second important factor as regards the present situation lies in the fact that we do not link our defeat only with the inability of the former leadership to resolve problems in an up-to-date fashion. It is necessary to rearm the party theoretically and ideologically, to target it on the struggle for a society of social justice, on operating in conditons of pluralism, and so forth. We were unable to achieve this at the congress. Therefore we now have to tackle organizational and theoretical questions simultaneously.

We feel under pressure from all directions. This is of course geared to a single aim—the weakening of the CPSL. At the same time attempts are made to persuade society along the following lines: Just look at them, the Communists are not even able to defend themselves. And in fact it is difficult to defend ourselves. The necessary mechanisms are lacking and the state is turning away from Communists as its citizens, which is primarily borne out by the numerous dismissals from their posts of leading officials who are Communist Party members.

It is now a question not of developing the party but of eliminating all left-wing forces altogether. This is necessary to ensure the influx of Western capital into Czechoslovakia. At the moment Civic Forum, other parties, and even many people in the government talk about anything you like—but not the economy. The economy is discussed in obscure, vague terms with a focus on pragmatic steps rather than a long-term program. In our opinion, this trend is going to intensify as the elections get nearer. What is the aim? To create political preconditions for attacks on and the dismantling of the existing economic base. The first step has been taken—structural changes in industry, the gamble on privatization, first attempts to cast aspersions on the cooperative system with a view to subsequently dismantling it, especially in the countryside. In short, a model which will be acceptable to Western capital is being molded and shaped.

Continuation of the "roundtable" talks no longer makes sense today. The struggle must be shifted to the parliament and the national committees. Via our deputies we must proclaim the party's viewpoint and seek to ensure that the government, which is intending to adopt unpopular measures, does not act unchecked to the detriment of the workers, peasants, and low-income strata of the population.

## West Europe

### Cypriot Government on Airport Security Measures

*LD1304175590 Moscow TASS in English 1717 GMT 13 Apr 90*

[Text] Nicosia April 13 TASS—Preventive emergency security measures have been in effect at Larnaca Airport since the beginning of last month, following threats by an Islamic group against airports and airlines involved in the transportation of Soviet Jewish emigres to Israel, the Government of Cyprus said in a communique.

Political observers say the threats were prompted primarily by statements by Yitzhaq Shamir, leader of the Israeli right-wing Likud bloc, and other ranking Israeli officials calling for the resettlement of newly-arriving Jewish immigrants in occupied Arab lands.

### USSR To Boost Petroleum Exports to Turkey

*TA1204120190 Ankara ANATOLIA in English 0900 GMT 12 Apr 90*

[Text] Moscow (A.A)—Turkey will buy more petroleum products from the Soviet Union and the Soviets will give more business to Turkish contractors, officials said on Wednesday.

State Minister Gunes Taner on Wednesday concluded economic talks with his counterpart, Soviet Foreign Economic Relations Minister Konstantin Katushev.

A Turkish official told A.A. [Ankara ANATOLIA] after the meeting that Turkey would import more oil, petrochemical products and fertilizers from the Soviet Union. In turn the Soviet Union would allocate more construction work to Turkish contractors.

The official also said the two sides had agreed in principle to extend a further 200-million-dollar Turkish loan to the Soviet Union.

The annual trade volume between Turkey and the Soviet Union reached 1.2 billion dollars at the end of 1989, up from 700 million dollars in 1988. The two countries aim to increase the trade volume to 2 billion dollars this year.

The two neighboring countries decided to boost economic relations at the end of 1984 when they signed a trade pact and agreed to extend a Soviet natural gas pipeline from Bulgaria to Turkey. In return for Turkey's natural gas purchases, the Soviets pledged to increase

their imports from Turkey and to allow Turkish companies to undertake construction work in the Soviet Union.

Turkey's Eximbank gave the Soviet Union a number of multi-million dollar credits last year to purchase imports from Turkey while as part of efforts to increase trade the two countries signed a cross-border trade agreement in Moscow last July.

The two countries are moreover considering opening two new border crossings in addition to the single crossing at the divided village of Sarp in the Black Sea province of Artvin which opened in 1988.

### 'Top Priority' Program on Germany Issue

*LD1404175290 Moscow in English to North America 2200 GMT 13 Apr 90*

["Top Priority" program with presenter Sergey Goryachev and analysts Sergey Plekhanov and Andrey Kortunov]

[Text] [Goryachev] How do you do, ladies and gentlemen, welcome to "Top Priority." I am Sergey Goryachev. On the menu today, European affairs, and in particular Germany. Big Germany will appear on the geographical map of Europe; it is not a matter of to be or not to be, but when exactly and under what conditions will it be unified, that is the question, and it still remains unanswered today. In the meantime President Bush rejected a Soviet suggestion that unified Germany could remain a member of both NATO and Warsaw Pact temporarily, he insisted that Germany must side with NATO. Two political analysts, Sergey Plekhanov and Andrey Kortunov, are here with me today. Welcome, gentlemen. I'd like to start our discussion by suggesting that it is probably not joining itself that concerns people on both sides of the ocean, it is fear of each other that still exists between the East and the West, and no one wants to lose in this deadly game. Would you agree with such an assumption? Sergey Plekhanov?

[Plekhanov] Yes, there is a residual fear of an East-West confrontation, and so people in the East are wary of what the West would do, and people in the West are wary of what the East would do. That is the legacy of the Cold War, which is still there to some extent, although at a much lower level. But there's another, more deep-seated fear in the East of—and not only in the East, among the neighbors of Germany—as to what a big powerful Germany would do. We have seen some opinion polls and we've seen that in Poland, for instance, there's a plurality of people who are afraid of a unification of Germany. As a result the Poles are now interested in keeping Soviet troops on Polish soil, I mean just a short time ago they were clamoring for getting the Soviet troops out and now they're interested and say, please wait and don't take those troops out because, you know, we want to be reassured in the face of a reunited Germany. In the Soviet Union I've seen public opinion polls which show that apprehension about a reunited Germany, while not a majority, is still a sizeable, characterizes the thinking of a sizeable minority, especially among older people who fought in the war, who remember the bad clashes we had, and who really do not want to see 1941 repeated. Among young people it's less of an apprehension, but it is an issue which troubles people. So I think there are those two fears.

[Goryachev] So, Germany or the future of Germany is more than just East-West relations. It is important by itself. Right?

[Plekhanov] I think that as the East-West tension continues to decline, the other fear might become more pronounced. But the bad thing is, the worst thing would be if the traditional Cold War fear is strengthened by the fear of a united Germany.

[Goryachev] All right. Andrey Kortunov, I think that the Soviet Union is particularly sensitive because if Germany becomes a member of NATO then we will lose an ally, that is the German Democratic Republic, what do you think about that?

[Kortunov] Well, you know, we have already lost it, if you want to put it bluntly, because...

[Goryachev, interrupting] That's what a lot of Soviet people are saying, I mean I read a lot of letters in the newspapers with some concern that we made too many concessions [words indistinct].

[Kortunov] Well, but you know if you have taken a weaker position...

[goryachev, interrupting] [words indistinct]

[kortunov, interrupting] Yes, well, if you are speaking about losing Eastern Germany I think that we lost it not now, but I think 40 years ago when we tried to impose the Stalinist economic and political system on the East German people. I think that was the time when we really lost it, and all what we are having now is just, you know, the consequences of what happened 40 years ago.

[Plekhanov] Right, but still you must recognize that if the levels of arms and armed forces remain as they are now and if the doctrines which guide the activities of the two military pacts in Europe continue to be the same, if there is now a fundamental restructuring of the alliances and the relations between them, then adding East Germany to NATO at the expense of the Soviet Union is bound to be seen as an important strategic loss for the Soviet Union, a change in the balance of power in the Soviet Union, er, in Europe, a change against the Soviet Union. That, I mean, there's no way that you can allay that fear and picture it in some benign light. You can forget about who is on whose side only if this new thinking is translated into new activity, if the relations between NATO and the Warsaw Pact become fundamentally transformed. That's why I think the idea that East Germany might, should, be incorporated into NATO is a very shortsighted and misguided approach. And that's why I for one would be in favour of hanging tough on insisting on formulas which retain some kind of

dual membership for united Germany, where both the Warsaw Pact and the NATO would have a role in a united Germany.

[Goryachev] You do not agree, I know.

[Kortunov] Well, you know, I think that just at theoretical level it would probably be the ideal solution for the problem because for the first time Germany will unite Europe rather than [Goryachev: rather than divide it] rather than divide it. And Germany will be just a perfect terrain to make these political and economic alliances defuse and melt in the center of our continent...

[Goryachev] But excuse me. You would like to see Germany as part of NATO, is that right?

[Kortunov] Well, I think that first of all it is in a way inevitable...

[Plekhanov] I disagree...

[Kortunov] ...and second, I think it can help to change the essence of NATO in case that, you know, current developments in Europe go on, but speaking of this ideal option, just to have both parts of Germany (?in different alliances). I think that it would be feasible only if the Warsaw Treaty was able to reconstruct itself to become political rather than military alliance, and now I really have strong reservations about such a possibility because nobody's interested in creating additional political institutions within the alliance. Even Poles who are now, you know, have some concerns about a united Germany and don't want to have the Soviets out, even they are reluctant to change something in the structure of political institutions of the alliance. At the military level the structures of the alliance are disintegrating very fast, you know the speed is tremendous. And therefore I don't think that the Warsaw Treaty and NATO can act as you know parallels or, you know, equal partners in this interaction. And if we take another side of the coin, the economic side, it would be not very serious to think that the COMECON and the EC can act as equal sides [words indistinct].

[Goryachev] We were talking about whether Germany should be part of NATO or whether it should be neutral. You're stating that it should be part of NATO, or that it is inevitable. Correct?

[Kortunov] Yes, and I think that we should...

[Goryachev] Sergey does not agree, excuse me.

[Plekhanov] I think that, No. 1, it's not inevitable; No. 2, the Soviet Union has a role to play in this process. And I think the Soviet Union should hang tough and insist that the security concerns in the East be taken full care of and I am not in favor of saying, oh give up and forget and let's move on.

[Kortunov] But we seem to be giving up already. Look, we used to insist that Germany should be neutral.

[Goryachev] First we insisted that it should not be united.

[Kortunov] It should not be, well, all right...

[Goryachev] It was too long ago. But first we insisted that Germany should be neutral, now we suggest that probably Germany will be, should be, a part of both NATO and the Warsaw Pact, but isn't that a compromise and President Bush and the West rejected the USSR's position? This is a demonstration of a tougher position.

[Plekhanov] I think there's been a movement on both sides toward some kind of a compromise which satisfies the positions of both sides. But I think there is one important element which is missing from our discussions. What is it that the Germans themselves would like to see? And I don't think that the Germans would go for a formula where the Soviet troops would be out of Germany and only the United States, Canada and...

[Goryachev] You mean East Germans or West Germans? I think...

[Plekhanov] I'm talking about...

[Goryachev, interrupting] ...(?views) are diferent...

[Plekhanov] I'm talking about a reunited Germany, I mean, they will not be East and West Germany, they will be one Germany. And I foresee a situation under which the Germans themselves would like to see foreign troops out, because the only function of such foreign troops would be to police the Germans, not to let them to do something bad to the others...[words indistinct]

[Goryachev, interrupting] But if Germany remains part of NATO, why, then, the foreign troops, American troops in this unified Germany will be confronting the Soviet Union.

[Kortunov] Not necessarily, no. After all, you know, NATO has always had three basic goals, just to, you know, keep the Russians out, to keep Americans in, and to keep Germans down. And I think that if the Cold War is over and if this explicit goal to keep Russians out is no longer in existence, then I think that the second, implicit, goal, to keep Germans down, can become more explicit and in this case it will be the end of NATO as an alliance because the united Germany will never tolerate, you know, a restricted status in world politics. And therefore I don't think that we should be afraid of German participation in NATO. Let them, you know, let them settle their own disputes within the alliance.

[Goryachev] Oh, this is more psychological, rather than political or military.

[Plekhanov] Psychology plays a huge role in political and military affairs, we all know, and even economic affairs. What people believe in becomes a reality.

[Goryachev] Well, Czechoslovakia and Hungary are asking the Soviet Union to withdraw its troops from these countries, and in East Germany the first non-communist government has come to power. And the United States insists that unified Germany is part of NATO. What can the Soviet Union do in practical terms? What is the Soviet room for maneuvering here to maintain his position? We seem to be on the weaker position. Am I right or wrong?

[Plekhanov] Well, in the sense that our alliance is having problems which it did not have, and NATO does not seem to be having similar kinds of problems, it does look like we are in a weaker position. But, again, it looks like a weaker position if you keep looking at it through the Cold War paradigm. My concern is that the Cold War mentality lingers on for too long, poisoning the minds, and that's why, you know, adding Germany to NATO is dangerous in terms of the psychological impact, because there is no way that you can persuade people not to view it as a change in the balance of power or the military-political nature in Europe. You know, you can bring up all the arguments, you can talk about the Germans becoming nice and you can talk about the future of Germany then going on its own, but people will be, you know, shaking their heads and saying well, you know, we're afraid.

[Kortunov] Well, I think that the best option we can choose is to devaluate the whole issue, especially because we cannot really influence its outcome. Therefore I think we should move our politics in the direction that will facilitate to turn NATO into just a club of democratic nations.

[Goryachev] (?For us) I mean, we should influence NATO to become a club of democratic nations?

[Kortunov] Yes, I think that, you know... [brief indistinct interruption] I think that, you know, our restraints in military sphere, our withdrawals from Eastern Europe will in fact influence the defence (?posture) of West European countries. We already see how Belgians for example acted. They are going to cut their defense budgets and I think in all West European nations, even in the United States, they have the same tendencies, and I think that in a year or two NATO will not be that important for East-West relationships. And in fact, I think the notion of balance of power, of forces in Europe will become simply irrelevant because there will be new, you know, dimensions of European politics.

[Plekhanov] That's right. That's why the existing bipolar structure, the delinearing [as heard] bipolar structure in Europe should be superseded by a different structure which involves both East and West. I don't think that one should view it as an extension of NATO to the East, inviting the Soviet Union in and everybody else in. But there should be something like the European peace organization or European security organization growing out of the Helsinki process, in which Germany will play a pivotal role and could really be a unifying factor in the sense that, yes, it will be neutral and at the same time it will not be seen as some kind of a special status nation. It will be equal to others but it will have to be in the framework of a larger European security [word indistinct].

[Goryachev] Now this is my next question. When we talk about European developments and prospects for German unification, or reunification, if you like, we think about the pan-European security system that would replace both NATO and the Warsaw Pact. What does it mean in practical terms? That means that there is no enemy any more? That's a different world.

[Plekhanov] Absolutely, but that there are no enemies any more.

[Goryachev] How do you see this European security? What will that include, well, in your view, how it can be built?

[Plekhanov] You know, the moment you begin to believe in it, it liberates your mind because, number one, the levels of arms would be much, much lower, probably there will be no nuclear weapons at all, there'll be non-defensive defense strategies adopted by all participants in the sense that you can only, you will only be and every nation will only be able to repel attack against itself, repel an aggression, that it would be able to protect its borders, but it would not be able to mount an offensive against its neighbors or anybody else. A European security organization would involve building structures which protect security on a pan-European and I think pan-Eurasian, because you will start with Vladivostok on the Pacific and end with Los Angeles on the Pacific as well. So it will be a huge global belt of security arrangements in which everybody could feel much more secure then...

[Goryachev] Andrey, you think it is possible at all?

[Kortunov] Well, I think that it is possible and I think that it is really necessary because we shouldn't somehow forget that even if the major conflict, East-West conflict is over, there'll be a lot of security problems in Europe. There can be tensions on sub-regional levels, for example in Eastern Europe, and if, even if we do not manage to avoid such crisis, we should think about how to control, to limit, them. Besides, there is a rising problem of political terrorism which will certainly, which will be a European problem as well as a global problem. So I think that first of all we should analyze a possible threat to European or Eurasian security in future and...

[Goryachev] Eurasia-America.

[Kortunov] Eurasia-American security in future, and then we should think about the necessary means to meet this possible threat, and here I know what really concerns me is that the Helsinki process, at least till now, has been too slow to create some institutions at operational level. And therefore, I don't think, you know, probably some

other institutions, [word indistinct] partially NATO institutions, maybe European Community institutions, maybe United Nations...

[Goryachev] Like what Eduard Shevardnadze suggested recently in his article in a NATO publication that a new institution, new institutions, should be established.

[Kortunov] Yes, I think that we should simply understand that the time is running out.

[Goryachev] Yes, and the time is running out for our program, too. Thank you very much, that was Top Priority, hosted today by Sergey Goryachev. My guests were Sergey Plekhanov, Andrey Kortunov, our two political analysts. Until next week, goodbye.

**Pope John Paul Receives Zagladin**

*LD1404125390 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1224 GMT 14 Apr 90*

[Text] Rome, 14 April (TASS)—In the Vatican on 14 April Pope John Paul II received V.V. Zagladin, an adviser to the USSR president, who handed over a message from M.S. Gorbachev to the head of the Roman Catholic Church.

In the course of the conversation which took place, the pope, having expressed satisfaction at the deepening of relations with the USSR, noted that the proximity of the sides' positions on many issues of international life makes it possible to hope for their useful interaction.

John Paul II spoke for the resolution of all problems arising in the course of perestroyka in the USSR and of the changes in East Europe, including the nationalities issue, on the basis of legality, in a spirit of tolerance, and by means of bilateral accords.

## Supreme Soviet Session

### Tax, Media, Pension Laws on 16 April Agenda

*LD1504194490 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 15 Apr 90*

[Text] The USSR Supreme Soviet session will continue its work tomorrow. As usual at the beginning of the week there are plans to examine a number of draft laws. Among them will be one of the most important—on taxation of the state, cooperative, rented, public, and other enterprises, associations, and organizations. It should become one of the links in the economic reform. Other draft laws which will be discussed are of no less importance— on the provision of pensions for the citizens, on press and other media. The problem of creating a consolidated program to eliminate the conseqences of the Chernobyl nuclear electric power station accident and the situation related to this disaster is also part of the Supreme Soviet plans.

### Taxation Bill Debated

*LD1604071690 Moscow TASS in English 0712 GMT 16 Apr 90*

[By TASS parliamentary correspondent]

[Text] Moscow April 16 TASS—The Soviet parliament started to discuss a bill on the taxation of enterprises today.

Along with the laws on property, land and leasing, the bill is to become another important component of the new economic system in the country. The bill is to be discussed at separate sittings of the two chambers of the Soviet parliament. The Council of the Union was the first to start the discussion.

The new taxation policy envisages the creation of equal opportunities for the economic activities of various kinds of enterprises—state, cooperative, lease, collective and others. Debates in the parliamentary chambers were preceded by the bill's discussion in parliamentary committees and commissions.

During the preliminary discussions, the first variant of the bill, which was introduced by the government, was considerably changed. Some changes simply made it correspond to alrady adopted economic laws.

The new bill is to become the mainstay of the programme to invigorate the transition to a regulated market economy in the Soviet Union, chairman of the parliamentary committee for economic reform Valentin Vologzhin said.

The second reading of the bill on pensions and the bill on the press and other mass media are also scheduled for this week. Debates on the program to clean up the aftermath of the Chernobyl disaster, introduced by the government, are expected on Wednesday.

### Supreme Soviet Committee Discusses KGB Law

*LD1304182490 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0900 GMT 13 Apr 90*

[By correspondent Olga Vasilenko from the USSR Supreme Soviet session in Moscow]

[Text] The concluding study of amendments to the bill on taxes of profits from enterprises, organizations, and cooperatives, which the Supreme Soviet is about to adopt, is taking place today in a considerable number of committees and commissions. Questions, which, on behalf of a committee or a commission, will be asked by some deputy or other, are being discussed jointly. The cost of the amendments which deputies intend to introduce is being calculated.

But, apart from this common work, a number of committees and commissions also have their special questions for today. There was such a question under discussion at the meeting of the Committee for Science, Public Education, and Upbringing. The deputies familiarized themselves with the USSR draft law on the State Security Committee. This is a working draft. It has been prepared by the committee itself and consists for the time being of eight sections and 30 articles.

As you know, the question of the need for such a law was raised at the Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies. It says in the preamble to the draft law: it determines the purpose, the functions and the rights of the State Security Committee, and also the common principle of the organization and the activities of bodies and troops subordinated to it. In it are such articles, for instance, as the legal basis of the KGB's activities, the second paragraph of which, by the way, gives rise to perplexity among all those present at the meeting: how the USSR KGB itself is to ensure the observance of socialist legality in the USSR KGB's activities.

The draft law designates the obligations of state bodies, public, and other organizations, officials and citizens with regard to giving assistance to the committee and the bodies and troops subordinated to it. The document reveals the content of the KGB's activities: the collection and analysis of intelligence; preventing and cutting short encroachments on the constitutional regime, the economic system and the defense might of our country; protecting state secrets, guarding the state border and ensuring the security of important national economic establishments; and also studying and predicting social processes affecting the country's state security. But proposals on the results of this study must be submitted to the Supreme Soviet and the Council of Ministers. The draft law determines the KGB's rights.

Incidentally, while this section was being discussed, a question arose among the deputies regarding the right to enter homes at any time of the day or night, with the authorization by the procurator, when pursuing persons who have committed crimes that have been referred by law to the investigative state security bodies or are

suspected of having committed such crimes, without permission from the procurator, but on condition that the procurator is subsequently notified. Well, here, on this point, the deputies were not unanimous and in order to form such a view they decided to seek advice from the Committee on Legislation.

It is important that it has been noted in the draft law that information on the activities of the KGB and of the bodies and troops subordinated to it can be received by USSR people's deputies in accordance with their status. It is true, in connection with this the question has arisen: With what status? What does one have in mind in the case at issue? The draft law determines the system of management and leadership of the KGB. And, important in the view of the deputies, but so far not precise in its content, is the article on the legal protection of servicemen of the KGB and citizens giving them assistance in ensuring state security and the struggle against crime. I remind you that this was the deputies' first familiarization with the draft law. The same work is to be carried out in all committees and commissions.

Well, as regards other committees and commissions, in my view that most interesting meeting is taking place today in the Commission for Labor, Prices, and Social Policies of the Soviet of the Union. Being examined there is the question of the state of trade and of measures to improve the work of trade. But, the meeting—I managed to listen to it with half an ear—is a very stormy one and we hope to tell you about it in greater detail at 1500 on the first programme of the radio. At this point I complete my report on the work in committees and commissions.

### Zelinskiy Interviewed on Law

*LD1504110790 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1030 GMT 13 Apr 90*

[Excerpts] At the session of the USSR Supreme Soviet. Over to the all-union radio correspondents' post at Prospekt Kalinina. Olga Vasilenko is on the line:

[Vasilenko] [passage omitted] I should like to draw listeners' attention to the sitting of the committee for science, public education, and culture. The point is that for the first time a draft law of which we have not yet told you, esteemed listeners, has been made known to this committee. This is the draft USSR law on the KGB. This document was presented to the deputies who are members of the committee by Igor Petrovich Zelinskiy. I invited him here to our studio when the sitting had finished. So then, Igor Petrovich. What about this draft law and the story of its appearance at the committees and commissions?

[Zelinskiy] The draft USSR law on the KGB is being examined in connection with an instruction from the Second Congress of People's Deputies, where an instruction was given to us, the Supreme Soviet, by the congress in the decision on the matter of combatting organized crime to draft a whole package of laws on the law and order bodies, the militia, the internal troops, the procuracy, and the Committee for State Security. In addition, this matter was on the agenda of our committee's work.

The law has been studied carefully by the Committee for Science, Public Education, and Culture of the USSR Supreme Soviet, although we are not really professionals and have dealt with this law from the purely humanitarian and human point of view. [passage omitted]

In principle, our committee recommended this draft law to the Supreme Soviet at the first reading, but of course we expressed a whole series of criticisms, which, in our view, are at least important, if not principled. First and foremost, this draft law was created before the presidential form of government was introduced in the country. Naturally such a law as the law about the USSR KGB should definitely take into account the presidential form of government and should correspond to the presidential form of government and to the existence of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the Council of Ministers.

[Vasilenko] After all, the KGB itself is the author of this draft law.

[Zelinskiy] Well, I do not know who is the author of this document, but evidently the KGB was one of the authors of this document which was introduced to the Supreme Soviet. We have the following additional criticism, that one must either remove or soften certain provisions such as this one: that the KGB itself ensures the observance of socialist legality in the activity of its own committee.

[Vasilenko] It supervises itself?

[Zelinskiy] It supervises itself. You recall how the deputies reacted to this provision, and we believe that the KGB cannot supervise itself. There is the president, the committee for constitutional supervision, and the USSR procuracy for that purpose.

[Vasilenko] And the Supreme Soviet as well?

[Zelinskiy] Of course, one has both the Supreme Soviet and the congress [of people's deputies] as the supreme legislative bodies of the country. I think that the leading role in supervision over the observance of socialist legality should belong, of course, to the USSR procuracy. This is the way we examined this issue, although, further down in the draft law, when individual articles in it are expanded, this is actually stated, that the USSR procuracy is the main supervisory body in the activity of any law-and-order organ in the country. We also think that the functions of the fight against organized crime should evidently be transferred to the USSR Ministry of the Interior, and that the KGB should be relieved of functions not pertaining to it. Maybe, such efforts from the KGB as assistance to the law-and-order bodies will be needed initially in the fight against organized crime, in the capacity of a more organized body which has iron discipline and a firm structure. Of course, such efforts would be needed. But later, I think that the KGB should concentrate its efforts mainly on protecting the interests

of the state and its citizens. We think that one must expand in the draft law, in our view, many issues concerning glasnost, accountability, and subordination of the KGB.

[Vasilenko] We know so little about the activity of that organ, despite the fact that there are more and more publications.

[Zelinskiy] Yes, and that interests the working people. For many years this was a closed sphere, taboo. But now the KGB itself—under the draft law that has been introduced—and the Supreme Soviet which sent us the draft law are, generally, undertaking resolute steps in the sphere of increasing glasnost, accountability, and subordination, for instance in maintaining access to archives and in analysis of social processes in the country, and so on. [passage omitted]

We will send our remarks about the draft law to the corresponding committees and commissions. We will also consult with the committee for legislation, the committee for the fight against crime, and the committee for state security, concerning the wording of individual articles and concerning individual definite inadequacies which we have noted. I think that we will try very hard to ensure that a law will appear in our country which both regulates the activity of the state security bodies and which guarantees to KGB personnel human rights for themselves, just as such rights are guaranteed to all citizens of the country.

[Vasilenko] Thank you.

### Commissions Discuss Market Economy Transition

*LD1304103890*

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 0800 GMT on 13 April carries a four-minute report by Vladimir Marken on the 13 April joint session of the Commission on Consumer Goods, Trade, Municipal, and Other Services and the Commission on Labor, Prices, and Social Policy. Marken interviews Viktor Nikolayevich Yaroshenko of the prices commission and Yuriy Mikhailovich Marinichev, deputy chairman of the consumer goods commission. Marken notes that K.Z. Terekh, minister of trade, delivered a report at the session on the work done in trade over the past year. Yaroshenko points out that at the session he raised the question of Terekh not being suitable for the post of trade minister. "Yes, I consider Comrade Terekh, minister of trade of the USSR, not suitable for the post he occupies. A year has passed since he was appointed to this post. We could somehow, with difficulty, reconcile ourselves to the fact that substantial improvements have not occurred in trade. However, we cannot reconcile ourselves to the fact that over this year a positive and constructive program of solutions to the crisis has not been proposed; that a serious analysis of the causes and consequences, and an economic analysis, have not been carried out; that measures, tactics, and a strategy for improving trade have not been proposed. That is why I raised the question of the unsuitability of the minister for the post he occupies," Yaroshenko says.

Yaroshenko complains that the trade minister was "completely unable to answer" the question of the role of the Ministry of Trade in the transition to a market economy. "The Ministry is not ready to go over to market relations," Yaroshenko says. He says that in the transition to a market economy, the ministry ought to expand the list of goods which are sold on the market. "It is necessary to begin to denationalize socialist property and that property ought to go onto the consumer market," Yaroshenko says.

Marinichev notes the difficulty of the task facing the trade minister and goes on to give his views of ways in which consumer demands can be met.

## Political & Social

### Gorbachev Chairs Federation, Presidential Council

*LD1404143490 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1406 GMT 14 Apr 90*

[Text] Moscow, 14 Apr (TASS)—A joint meeting of the Federation Council and the Presidential Council of the USSR took place in the Kremlin today under the chairmanship of USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev.

A report was heard from Yuriy Maslyukov, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the USSR State Planning Committee, "on the change-over to a regulated market economy in the USSR." Members of the Presidential Council as well as scholars invited to the meeting exchanged opinions on the report.

There was a great variety of opinions and points of view, but all the speakers agreed that life dictates the necessity of speeding up the economic reform, seeking out and actively introducing new methods of guiding the economy, and new forms of economic management. It was stressed that there could be no further delay in implementing measures in this sphere.

It was decided to continue the discussion next week.

### Economic Reform Discussed

*LD1404191190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1730 GMT 14 Apr 90*

[Text] Today in the Kremlin, under the chairmanship of USSR President Gorbachev, a joint sitting took place of the Council of the Federation and the Presidential Council. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev opened it. He said:

[Begin Gorbachev recording] As we agreed, at today's joint sitting of the Presidential Council and the Council of the Federation we are to tackle issues connected with the progress of the economic reform and with making it more radical, on the basis of the conversation we have

been having, beginning at the start of the year. We already understood the necessity of such an approach, and we finally got to it somewhere around the beginning of March, by the beginning of March. There is a proposal to build this work as follows. The government has done a great deal of work on this. I mean the State Commission for Economic Reform and, within it, the State Planning Committee. Then, in the final stage, the government headed by Nikolay Ivanovich, and including the entire presidium, deliberated on it in a very thorough way in several meetings, inviting people to discuss these issues, and first and foremost cooperating all the time with our scientists and our scientific institutions, inviting economic managers, and inviting representatives of the republics. In particular, one meeting of the presidium was devoted to such issues, at which the chairmen of the Council of Ministers were present. Thus a lot of consulting took place, a complete marathon. What it is planned to propose today, and what you have received, what we are to discuss today, that already is, so to speak, the result of that major work. [end recording]

The meeting heard a report by Maslyukov, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the State Planning Committee, about the transition to a regulated market economy in the USSR.

An exchange of opinions unfolded concerning the report, during which Aytmatov, Vorotnikov, Kauls, Nazerbayev, Osipyan, Primakov, Rasputin, Revenko, Shevardnadze, Shevchenko, Yakovlev, and Yarin spoke, as well as the economists invited to the sitting— Aganbegyan, Arbatov, Bogomolov, Martynov and (Yaremenko).

Expressing a great variety of views and opinions, all those who spoke agreed that life dictates the necessity to accelerate economic reform, and to seek and actively introduce new methods of economic administration and new forms of management. It was stressed that it is impossible to delay the implementation of measures in this sphere any longer. It was decided to continue the discussion next week.

### Gorbachev Nominated as Candidate Congress Delegate

*PM1204181190 Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 13 Apr 90 p 1*

[Own correspondent B. Prokhorov report: "Workers Nominate"]

[Text] Stavropol Kray—M.S. Gorbachev has been nominated as candidate delegate to the 28th CPSU Congress for the party electoral district of Cherkessk City.

The assembly hall of Cherkessk Chemical Association was overflowing. An open party meeting began. On behalf of the party committee and the management, Hero of Socialist Labor Zakhar Soslanbekovich Tsakhilov proposed that Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev be nominated as a candidate delegate to the 28th CPSU Congress. He was seconded by Valentina Alekseyevna Kerimova, instrument controller in the No. 5 shop. Capital Construction Department Chief Boris Sultanovich Apsov, fitter Viktor Afanasyevich Solnyshkin, Design Department Chief Viktor Sergeyevich Lykin, and others also spoke.

I chatted with many communists before the meeting opened. This is what they said:

"We suffer from eternal swings. State idlers were decorated with stars, and now we are unable to estimate at its true worth the really strenuous activity of perestroyka's pioneers."

"Odes were written about former statesmen. But what do we know about Gorbachev's path? Who has heard, for example, that he received his first Order of the Labor Red Banner when he was 16, working on a combine harvester?"

"Workers trust in Gorbachev...."

"I am a nonparty person," fitter Anatoliy Ivanovich Dmitriyev said. "But I am impatiently awaiting the opening day of the party congress. And, to be honest, I cannot imagine our party without a leader such as Gorbachev."

While he was still secretary of the All-Union Lenin Communist Youth League Stavropol Kray Committee, M.S. Gorbachev repeatedly visited this enterprise for the production of paint and varnish products, which few people knew about in those times. When he headed the kray party organization, Mikhail Sergeyevich did much to ensure the development of various sectors of industry in the steppe kray.

The meeting was addressed by Valentin Yegorovich Lesnichenko, first secretary of Karachayevo-Cherkess Oblast CPSU Committee. He pointed out in particular:

"The oblast's communists submitted more than 600 suggestions and amendments to the draft CPSU Central Committee Platform and the party's draft new Statutes. This attests that our communists are not indifferent to the party's present course. M.S. Gorbachev warmly recalls Karachayevo-Cherkessia in his book 'Perestroyka and the New Thinking.' And the autonomous oblast remembers and values the concern and deeds of our fellow countryman."

The meeting voted unanimously to nominate M.S. Gorbachev as a candidate delegate to the 28th CPSU Congress.

### Further Reportage on 21st Komsomol Congress

#### Report on Second Day

*LD1204230890*

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 2035 GMT on 12 April carries a 30-minute report on the second day of the 21st Komsomol (All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League) Congress in

Moscow by correspondent Aleksandr Ukhov. Delegate Andrey Sharonov, USSR people's deputy, calls in his speech for a major change in youth policy and for a totally different attitude from the Komsomol.

Ukhov explains in the foyer that cosmonaut Serebrov is giving a press conference here to mark Cosmonauts' Day. Serebrov tells the correspondent that the country must strive to produce literate and technically capable young people in order to progress.

The camera switches back to the congress session and a speech by Vladimir Kudlash, first secretary of the Belorussian Komsomol organization. Kudlash says that the Komsomol has a right to demand better opportunities and a better position for young people; but the Komsomol must make a contribution of its own toward achieving this goal.

A speaker from Kemerovo Oblast Komsomol organization speaks about the need for pluralism in the Komsomol. He says that he is involved with a minority group within the Komsomool, and says that minorities want to play a part in attaining united goals for the whole Komsomol movement.

Ukhov introduces pictures of the drafting commission and proceeds to interview Komsomol Central Committee Secretary S. Epifantsev about his role on that commission. Epifantsev insists that he is not imposing the views of the Komsomol leadership, but is merely attempting to make a useful contribution to the general discussion of goals.

Another Komsomol congress organizer is interviewed about how procedural matters, such as the authenticity of notes to the platform and the order of speakers, are being decided.

Ukhov introduces a press conference in a side room with Komsomol First Secretary Mironenko. Ukhov asks: "Does the first secretary of the VKLSM (Komsomol) Central Committee think that at this congress organizational registration will take place of those youth political tendencies which have appeared at this congress?"

Mironenko replies: "No, I do not think that the organizational registration of youth tendencies will take place at this congress. I think that this congress may create the conditions for the subsequent registration of those tendencies."

Ukhov asks: "And I have a second question. The press center has just distributed the proposals for candidacies for the post of first secretary of the VKLSM Central Committee. For the time being, there are only five surnames, and I will announce them—Mironenko, (Yutis), Smirnov, (Tasmaganbetov), and (Skoropat). Rumors are circulating among the delegates and newsmen that you will withdraw your candidacy at the very last moment. Is this true or not?"

Mironenko replies: "Well, one must never believe rumors. As for whether I stand or not, this will depend largely on how the congress will pass—for me personally, at least."

A video clip from a film advertising Komsomol assistance for young people moving to the countryside to live and work follows.

The camera switched back to the congress where Ganin, secretary of the Komsomol organization at Perm State University, calls in a speech for reforms within the Komsomol movement, in order to create a platform for genuine unity within the organization.

An Iraqi journalist covering the congress tells Ukhov in a corridor that the Komsomol must avoid a split at all costs. Unity is paramount, he says.

Aleksandr Kiselev, USSR people's deputy, who has been involved in restructuring the local Komsomol organization in Volgograd, tells the correspondent in a foyer interview that the Komsomol must be broad-minded and democratic, and must offer something to attract a wide spectrum of young people.

An unidentified female delegate was then shown making a speech with various proposals in the congress hall. She criticized the government for not encouraging the development of youth organizations' enterprises. She makes the following proposal: "Through a legislative initiative, the 21st VKLSM Congress proposes that the USSR Supreme Soviet should review the procedure for taxation established in the draft law (on enterprises) for public and for public-and-political organizations and for their enterprises, and should take into consideration—when elaborating a new procedure for taxation—the interests of young people."

A male delegate stands up in the hall and says: "I am (Yezhov) from Vorkuta. As a communist, just as many in this hall, I would like to learn the opinion of Comrade Ligachev on this matter." (applause)

Political member Yegor Ligachev stands up from the body of the hall (he was not previously visibly present) and says: "I consider that you are raising an absolutely correct question here. I think that support undoubtedly is required for this new and extremely important cause, which I think you are conducting with clean hands, with reason and with intelligence, sufficiently efficiently and beneficially—support primarily and the creation of a privileged taxation position. (applause) But I think, I think that, if you, so to speak, will trust me, then I, too, will add my voice and I will attempt to convince my colleagues in the Politburo and Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev personally, and I will call upon you, if you and I decide the issue thus and positively, although I do not guarantee it, since we already have entered into different conditions in political life, when not only the Politburo decides an issue, but also many issues are decided by the Supreme Soviet, our parliament, our system (laughter).... Do not think that I am avoiding this

question. I am also explaining to you what difficulties and complexities lie ahead. And I call on you to ensure a highly efficient introduction of this cause."

The diary of the Komsomol congress then ends. A screen caption says that the 21st Komsomol congress is continuing its work.

### Most Youths 'Not Interested'

*LD1404140890 Moscow TASS in English 1355 GMT 14 Apr 90*

[By TASS special correspondents]

[Yext] Moscow April 14 TASS—Despite the fact that most young people expect radical changes in Komsomol, it is still difficult to say whether they will take place at the current congress of the Young Communist League (Komsomol) [YCL] or not. Although half of the time assigned for the congress is over, there is no end of remarks and observations dealing with the time-limit and the procedure. Sometimes the impression is that the main task of every speaker is to argue with the previous one or try to refute his words.

At plenary sessions delegates speak mostly about problems accumulated in their primary organisations. Only one fifth of the speakers raise the question about the future structure of the youth organisation and are concerned over the defence of rights and interests of the younger generation.

Although 2,000 delegates to the congress have been trying for three days to make the discussion more even and to outline more clearly ways of further development of the country's youth movement, most rank-and-file Komsomol members in Moscow do not show interest in the congress and are not going to follow its work. This information was given to journalists by the congress's sociological service. Such feelings can probably be explained by the fact that 78 per cent of young people are not interested at all in Komsomol activities and problems, while two thirds do not believe that it can preserve its unity within the YCL framework and expect new independent organisations to be created.

Responding to the question if Komsomol should be the leader among youth organisations, 79 per cent of the polled answered in the negative. So far as relations between Komsomol and the Soviet Communist Party are concerned, 73 per cent of the polled believe that renewed Komsomol should be independent from the party.

On Saturday afternoon and on Sunday the congress will continue its work at discussion centers. The delegates will discuss the new draft programme and rules, Komsomol's relationship with the Communist Party and other issues.

### Ligachev, Others Attend

*LD1204215290 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 12 Apr 90*

[From the "Vremya" newscat]

[Text] Today was the second day of the work of the 21st Congress of the All-Union Leninist Komsomol. It was attended by Comrades Ligachev, Girenko, Manayenkov and Usmanov. The congress will continue its work tomorrow.

### Ligachev Says Party Split 'Already Happening'

*LD1504220190*

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1915 GMT on 15 April carries a 30-minute program entitled "Komsomol Diary" which reports on the day's events at the Komsomol congress.

The program opens with an unidentified journalist asking Mironenko, first secretary of the Komsomol Central Committee, what he sees as the main issue at the congress. He replies: "The main issue of this congress is the direction in which our Youth League is to develop." The journalist then asks several deputies for their views on the future of the Komsomol.

The report then goes in turn to the various discussion centers in which delegates work, showing delegates speaking, arguing and debating. At the discussion center entitled "The Komsomol and the CPSU," a correspondent interviews Yu. I. Ryzhkov, deputy head of the party building and cadre work department of the CPSU Central Committee, who stresses the importance of the links between the CPSU and the Komsomol.

The video then shows Yegor Kuzmich Ligachev in the audience, and then being asked by a journalist: "Is a split of the Komsomol into groups probable and which of them, say, would support the party?"

Ligachev replies: "I would like now, since I have been asked to say a few words, I would like to say, first of all, that everyone is saying that there will be a split. This split is already happening. What questions can there be? What has happened in Lithuania? What has happened in Estonia? What has happened in Latvia? There is no longer a united Communist Party. And the first one I mentioned: There the so-called independence of the Lithuanian Republic has been declared. So, it is in vain that we are told, that we should, so to speak, wait until the congress. On the contrary, we are late and in this case, most regrettably, we are too late, because the processes are already under way.

I believe, I believe that the Komsomol, as I have already said, has been, is, and will remain communist and Leninist, but it must, without fail, improve itself, transform itself, become renewed and it should under no circumstances, be similar to what, at one time, we made it. I am profoundly convinced of this. I say this not in my

professional role, this is simply the way I contemplate it, the way I think, the way I understand all these processes. Humanity, including the party, communists, and the Komsomol, have developed a colossal wealth. Let us think about continuity as well. Let us think also about good, healthy traditions. If we do both, we improve ourselves and restructure ourselves and take everything necessary from the past, things will go well, things will get better."

Ligachev is then asked about the large number of members and candidate members of the CPSU participating in the congress.

He replies: "Well, I believe that young communists have never been superfluous people in the Komsomol, rather they have always been those who cemented the Komsomol, who created and formed it, so this, from my point of view, is a positive aspect."

An unidentifed correspondent continues the report, looking at the other discussion centers and interviewing more delegates on their views on such issues as the financial and economic activity of the Komsomol and the organization's statutes. The report ends with a song and captions indicating the results of a poll conducted among young people in Moscow on the Komsomol.

## PRAVDA Urges Precongress 'Shakeout'

*PM1504184190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Apr 90 First Edition p 1*

[Editorial: "For Consolidation on the Basis of the Principles of Perestroyka"]

[Text] The CPSU Central Committee's recently published open letter "For Consolidation on a Principled Basis" is being actively discussed by the country's communists and by the entire public. "We have read the CPSU Central Committee's open letter and exchanged opinions," Aleksey Kudryakov, secretary of the party committee of Rybinsk Instrument-Making Plant, says. "Instrument makers are very definitely in favor of this way of formulating the question. Moreover, we are sure that it would not have hurt to make such an appeal to party members even earlier, without delaying. The plant party organization shares the idea of the CPSU Central Committee Platform and is unshakably behind communist ideals, socialism, and Leninism." Of course, there are also other, contradictory and ambivalent views. This is understandable. No truly revolutionary break—and perestroyka is just such a radical process—can manage without a struggle, including a political struggle.

Step by step our society is beginning to emerge onto the road of democracy, freedom, and legality. The party itself has entered a period of profound changes. In connection with the transfer of commanding functions to the soviets, the role of the CPSU in society's life, the substance and methods of its work, and the nature of cooperation with other sociopolitical organizations and movements are changing. The all-around democratization of internal party relations is taking place.

A precongress debate of decisive significance for the party's self-renewal has begun in this situation. This is an exchange of opinions unprecedented for many decades in terms of its scale and depth and the importance of the questions being discussed. The debate was seen as most important by the CPSU Central Committee February and March Plenums, which adopted the draft CPSU Central Committee Platform and the draft new party Statutes. These formulated our party's strategic goal—humane, democratic socialism. The Central Committee presented its view of ways to advance toward this goal and to reform the party.

The Central Committee's open letter is an important step in the development of these ideas and the result of a sober analysis of the situation in the party and in society. It is not the fruit of "apparatus intrigues," as certain authors try to make out, but the result of great collective work by members of the Central Committee and local party organizations, whose opinions were taken into account during lengthy discussions. The Central Committee letter has been openly submitted for discussion by the whole party and the entire people, which once again indicates the CPSU's adherence to the policy of glasnost and openness and to the priority of the party masses' authority.

We all have a sincere interest in seeing that problems of vital importance to the party are discussed in a businesslike way in party organizations and enriched by the collective reason of communists and nonparty people who feel their responsibility for the country's future. This is what is happening today: Opinions are being compared in the pages of the press and in party organizations, and there is competition among alternative proposals on key questions of the life of the party and society.

However, it is important for this creative search to lead to the party's consolidation on the basis of the positions of perestroyka and not to its disunity or, still less, to a split in it. The CPSU Central Committee letter points out that attempts by certain circles to divert the party from the strategic course which it has taken proceed from both the "right" and the "left" flanks, which, despite seeming differences, meet up in the end. This can well be seen in the attitude toward the draft CPSU Central Committee Platform "Toward Humane, Democratic Socialism." Take, for example, those party members who feel a kind of nostalgia for the past and are confused by the pressing changes. They see the imaginary "deviation of the CPSU leadership from the basic principles of scientific socialism" as the chief cause of the party's declining prestige. In the opinion of the instigators of the so-called "recreation of the Russian Communist Party within the CPSU," this "deviation" was also reflected in the draft Central Committee Platform. And others directly accuse the CPSU's political leadership of "sliding onto the social democratic path"

and lacking "substantial qualitative differences" between the "Democratic Platform" and the draft CPSU Central Committee Platform. Conservatism, dogmatism, and an incapacity for dialogue lead to defeats in the exacerbated ideological and political struggle. It would be an unpardonable mistake not to see this, still less to tolerate it. The party cannot be, does not have the right to be, yesterday's party and be led along by conservative trends or separatist, nationalist, and chauvinist sentiments.

Another trend that has taken shape quite clearly of late is also extremely dangerous. Forces that are waging a struggle against the party are shaping up under the flag of perestroyka and essentially under cover of the CPSU's policy, recognized by the people, of the revolutionary renewal of society. Presenting themselves as "democrats" and the sole champions of radical changes, these people make endless attacks on the party's ideological foundations, on Leninism, and on the socialist choice made by our people in October 1917. Noteworthy in this connection is the activity of a number of persons who sided with the movement of communists who united around the so-called "Democratic Platform" and who use this trend for their own ambitious ends. This movement emerged on the wave of renewal in the party.

Of course—and this is stated in the Central Committee's open letter—there is nothing reprehensible in the fact that some group of party members has expounded its views by presenting an alternative draft of the party platform. Let us recall, incidentally, that the CPSU Central Committee invited communists precisely to draw up such alternative documents. The "Democratic Platform" was published in PRAVDA, and CPSU members are voicing their opinions of that document within the framework of a broad discussion and comparing its points with the CPSU Central Committee's draft. PRAVDA's "Discussion Pamphlets" also carry critical and very hard-hitting statements on the Central Committee Platform. So it is hardly possible to take seriously the accusations issuing from the lips of the "Democratic Platform's" leaders today that PRAVDA has been "baiting reformist communists." Incidentally, precisely those who are accusing PRAVDA today have repeatedly substantiated their own position in its pages. It evidently never occurs to the "democrats" that free debate in the press and in party organizations is a normal, democratic process that is perfectly natural for a party renewing itself.

The CPSU Central Committee is concerned by the fact that, instead of a constructive discussion of problems of concern to the party, individual persons, speaking on behalf of the "Democratic Platform," have mounted feverish propaganda and organizational activity aimed at organizationally isolating a section of party members. Supporters are being recruited and registered, coordinating councils have been set up at the center and in certain regions, and emissaries are being sent to the provinces. The question has been raised of forming a material base independent of the CPSU and even of some "division" or else seizure of party property and the mass media. In addition, calls are being heard for the creation of a different political organization that bears no relation to the CPSU. Thus, the true aim of certain authors of the "Democratic Platform" is not just a split in the CPSU from within, but also the organizational formation of a political party opposing the CPSU. The differences among them concern only the timing of the formation of this new organization: Some propose doing this before the 28th congress, others at the congress or right after it. This is essentially a policy of eliminating the CPSU and removing it from the political arena. While declaring that nothing links them with the CPSU, at the same time they do not quit its ranks, as a truly honest politician would do, but carry out active work aimed at undermining the party from within. What attitude can one take toward those who, while paying lipservice to the party's renewal and perestroyka, in fact nurse a grievance and act hypocritically by preparing for themselves in advance a place in another political organization?

The logic of the political struggle has led us to the conclusion that to preserve the party and its future it is vitally necessary to break off relations with those who deny the Soviet people's socialist choice and our party's fundamental ideological, theoretical, and organizational foundations, who kindle interethnic dissension, who have adopted a policy of undermining the CPSU's unity, and who are creating within it organizationally formalized factions with their own group discipline.

The chief purpose of the CPSU Central Committee's addressing an open letter to the country's communists is to consolidate the party's healthy forces before the congress, so that it can arrive unified, strong, and cohesive at this important point in the life of the CPSU. The party has been forced to defend itself, and it must defend itself, because it is being threatened with a split. This is why a shakeout [razmezhevaniye]—ideological and, in a number of cases, organizational, too—of persons who think and act in such an extremist manner is inevitable. Naturally, this must be a matter for the communists themselves, for party organizations and committees. And, of course, this must be done without carrying things too far, mindful of the fact that there can be no question today of any "purge" of the party.

A shakeout does not mean a struggle against "dissidence" and "dissidents" in the party. This is the Leninist position, and the Central Committee follows it. Vladimir Ilich called for independent people to be valued and for people who "think differently or approach the matter differently" to be respected (Vol. 54, p 73). Unfortunately, in some places in the provinces the Central Committee's open letter has been perceived as a signal for reprisals against independent-minded communists or as an excuse for some sort of "revenge" by conservative forces. For example, fears are being voiced in party organizations, as PRAVDA's correspondent reports from Dnepropetrovsk and Zaporozhye, that the Central Committee letter may be used as an excuse for reprisals

against all "objectionable" people, and communists are anxious lest follies be committed here and waverers be alienated from the party.... It must be stated clearly and definitely: There is and can be no going back to the practice of past times, to the methods of the twenties and the thirties.

We are already encountering attempts to distort the meaning and substance of the Central Committee's open letter and to impose the idea that the Central Committee is calling for people with independent views and convictions to be gotten rid of. This was manifested, in particular, during the discussion at the 21st All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League Congress. However, the Central Committee letter speaks not of a struggle against convictions but of those who through their views and **conduct** have virtually placed themselves outside the party.

It is necessary, above all, to explain to communists the essence of the question: There are no insuperable differences between the CPSU Central Committee's draft and the many other alternative platforms, including the "Democratic Platform," insofar as they are geared to our party's renewal and democratization. We must jointly implement what is involved in the policy adopted by the CPSU and the entire people of restructuring our society. The self-seeking aims of certain leaders who are trying to make a political career out of communists' democratic aspirations are another matter. Incidentally, they do not even conceal these aims. And the attitude toward such people must, of course, be different. This is why all work on explaining and discussing the letter must be combined with a strictly individual approach to ascertaining the positions of supporters of various platforms and trends, particularly with regard to wavering party members who have been misled and been unable to get to the bottom of the processes taking place in society.

Why is a shakeout necessary before and not during the congress? This is necessary, above all, in order not to turn the party into some amorphous formation fragmented into many parts at precisely the time when its unity and cohesion are vitally necessary and when perestroyka is experiencing almost the most difficult and dramatic period in its development. Those who intend to essentially destroy the party cannot be allowed to drag along liquidationist aspirations to the congress, to realize their ambitious plans, and, in the final analysis, to wreck perestroyka. For it is a question here not of "free competition of ideas," as certain factional leaders attempt to convince us, but of tough, hypocritical tactics to seize power in the party which resurrect past unlamented Stalinist customs and methods of struggle. People must be made well aware of this. The debate in the party—broad, free, constructive, and creative—will be and must be continued; both during the preparations for the 28th congress and at the CPSU Congress itself. The Central Committee's open letter not only does not impose a limit on such discussions but actively encourages a businesslike and frank exchange of opinions in the party.

In the course of the report and election campaign and the nomination of delegates for the 28th congress, it is necessary to ensure the comprehensive examination and discussion of their programs and positions, imparting broad glasnost to this work. Party committees must define expedient ways for communists to discuss the open letter. Every effort must be made to ensure that the discussion takes place in a truly democratic, comradely, creative atmosphere and contributes to the consolidation of healthy forces in the party and to successful preparations for the 28th CPSU Congress.

The party needs not a purge but a purification, not a split but a consolidation of ranks on the basis of the principles of revolutionary perestroyka. It is on this that our progress along the path of humane, democratic socialism and the creation of an open, free, and flourishing society will largely depend.

## 'Marxist Platform' Organizes; Holds Conference

*LD1404225590 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 14 Apr 90*

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Well, as we can see, party life within the CPSU is becoming increasingly intense on the eve of the congress. And there is news not only of the resolution of organizational issues but also of guests on the ideological level.

[D. Kiselev, identified by screen caption] A session of communists is taking place. Let us recall at this point that the so called Democratic Platform was the first one to be drawn up in the Communist Party of the Soviet Union for the 28th congress. Then the draft platform adopted by the current Central Committee appeared. In the meantime a third draft has appeared in the party. It is called the Marxist Platform in the CPSU. The Marxist Platform is a movement within the party whose founding conference began work today in the town of Bykovo near Moscow. Judging by preliminary documents and the discussions which have started, the movement unites those who are in favor of a return to classical Marxism.

The main positive idea of Karl Marx is the destruction of private property as the source of exploitation. Are you also opposed to private property?

[A.V. Buzgalin, member of the organizational committee of the conference of supporters of the Marxist Platform of the CPSU] You know, to be brief the answer is yes. But to be more serious, it must be destroyed not by means of decrees—that is completely senseless. We must be capable of organizing a more effective economy through economic methods.

[Kiselev] And so the basis of the economy is public property; private property has no future. The main aim, they are saying here, is the creation by the majority of the people of conditions for joint, free labor. To bring the country out of its crisis the supporters of the Marxist

Platform are discussing the following urgent measures: The adoption of a statewide program for a struggle against the shadow economy; the conducting of monetary reform in order to obstruct the obtaining of illegal income; providing public control over the correlation between the measure of labor and consumption; the creation of a system of workers' control. The movement arises from the federation of Marxist party clubs and supports the elimination of the existing model of the CPSU as a party of barrack-room communism, but it is not in favor of the elimination of the Communist Party itself. In other words, these Marxists would like to gain the right to a second attempt, and this is how they are approaching the 28th congress.

[Buzgalin] We are not acting as a faction as yet. It is an association of likeminded people who are engaged in propagating a certain set of ideas, in supporting them first of all. If there is a growing apart at the congress and factions are formed, then I think it will be a faction.

[Kiselev] The discussions in Bykovo will end tomorrow with the election of a council of the movement of supporters of a Marxist Platform in the CPSU. At the founding conference, 308 delegates from 54 towns in the country were registered today. [video shows auditorium and foyer]

### Platform Explained

*90UN1431A Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY in Russian No 14, 7-13 Apr 90 p 8*

[Text] We continue to familiarize readers with new social and political organizations. The platform of the Marxist Workers Party-Party of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat (MWP-PDP) is described by Yu. Leonov, a member of its council.

The constituent congress of the MWP-PDP was held on 25 March in Moscow. Workers, representatives of major industrial centers of the country—Moscow, Leningrad, Kuybyshev, Sverdlovsk, Donetsk, Riga, Magnitogorsk, Minsk, Kishinev, and others (more than 60 cities altogether)—elected a nine-man executive collective body—the party council.

The new party will be guided in all its activity by Marxist teaching, which has for dozens of years been distorted and continues to be distorted in our country. Our task in the field of theory is to return to the workers their formidable theoretical weapon.

The party makes the cornerstone the interests of the working class, which has in fact been sidelined from control of the state. It is the workers, who constitute a majority in the country, who should be heading the struggle of the peasantry and the progressive intelligentsia for the eradication of all forms of exploitation on the part of multimillion-strong officialdom and the young Soviet bourgeoisie.

The MWP-PDP advocates the dictatorship of the proletariat—democracy for the majority. The working class is capable of assuming responsibility for emergence from the most profound crisis and for ensuring a normal human life not for the select, but for all. Under the conditions of disintegration of the economy, disregard for the interests of the broad working masses, omnipotence of the party-bureaucratic machinery, growing interethnic conflicts and the political darting from extreme to extreme—under these conditions only the dictatorship of the proletariat may save society from civil war.

The dictatorship of the proletariat means transition from the hire of workers to the hire of managers, abolition of all types of party schedule, and proportional representation of all groups and strata of society in the legislative bodies. We advocate real worker self-management and the organization of worker councils (committees) with broad political and economic rights. A fundamental reorganization of the directive planned economy and abolition of the system of standard outputs and job prices, which in all countries of state capitalism, including the USSR, have become an instrument of bureaucratic domination, are essential for this.

The MWP-PDP is convinced that a "free market," which the present leadership is proposing for the country, would lead to the impoverishment of the working people, primarily the working class, the needy strata of the population, and pensioners. The growth of crime, price rises, unemployment, and the division of society into rich and poor—this is the price we are having to pay for the reformers' attempts to turn back the wheel of history. But there is an alternative to the "administrative system" and the "free market!" And our party is prepared to substantiate it.

The main principles of our platform amount to a way out of the crisis not at the expense of the workers. We support distribution according to labor (we have not had and do not now have such distribution). Our party advocates an alliance with the intelligentsia and with the strata of society that recognize the Marxist conclusion that the liberation of the workers is the condition for the liberation of all. We support proletarian internationalism and the unity of the workers and working people of all nationalities and republics. We support all democratic demands if they correspond to the interests of the working majority. We will struggle for our influence by ideological means and do not aspire to become the governing party ("dictatorship of the class, not dictatorship of the party!").

It needs to be emphasized that the dictatorship of the proletariat is not for us an end in itself. Having done away with the old division of labor and having organized the economy on the basis of full self-management with the aid of its dictatorship, the working class will have also removed the cause of all class contradictions. Relations of domination and compulsion will recede into the past, as will, consequently, the need for any dictatorship whatever. Our goal is a classless self-managing society—socialism.

## To Eliminate 'Hired Labor'

*LD1404234290 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1920 GMT 14 Apr 90*

[From the "Television News Service" program]

[Text] Party life is becoming more active on the eve of the CPSU congress. Today brought interesting news in this respect.

[Begin recording] [D. Kiselev, identified by screen caption] Another platform for the congress has taken shape in the CPSU, the third one in succession—a Marxist one. Today its supporters held a founding conference in Bykovo, in the Moscow area.

Free labor: This phrase is being used with too diverse meanings. What do the supporters of the Marxist Platform invest this concept with?

[A.I. Kolchanov, member of the organizational committee of the conference, identified by screen caption] First of all, we invest this concept with the elimination of the system of hired labor, above all that hired labor which up until now has been based on non-economic coercion in our system: on features of the totalitarian oppression of the working class, so to speak, and on the various forms of tying it to its workplace of limiting its income by administrative means, and of restricting the working population's mobility.

We are, however, just as much in favor of that hired labor which is based on private economic exploitation. We are against the economic coercion of the labor force to work. We are in favor of the liberation of work, of free association through work, to put it in Marx's words.

[Kiselev] In other words, work as a requirement.

[Kolchanov] Yes, we are striving for this, and we consider the first step to be the development of self-government.

[A.V. Buzgalin, member of the organizational committee of the conference, identified by screen caption] We disagree very strongly with the Democratic Platform, but personally, I categorically disagree with calls for an organizational withdrawal on the eve of the congress. That would be the first small step toward returning once again to administrative methods of leading the party and the communists. It seems to me that the Central Committee's letter was dictated not so much by the struggle for purity of ideas as by fears for the party property, party ownership which the Democratic Platform wants to take over in part. Yet these communists have, by the way, paid their party dues and have a right to some portion of party property. That is my opinion.

[Kiselev] The founding conference of the Movement of Supporters of the Marxist Platform in the CPSU will continue work in Bykovo. [end recording]

## Platform Members Interviewed

*LD1504172890 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 15 Apr 90*

[Report by Correspondent Vladimir Korablev from the conference of supporters of the Marxist Platform of the CPSU in Bykovo]

[Text] Today is the final day of the conference of supporters of the Marxist Platform of the CPSU which is taking place in the town of Bykovo near Moscow. Our correspondent Vladimir Korablev reports:

[Begin recording] [Korablev] And so, on the threshold of the 28th party congress, another platform has appeared—the Marxist Platform of the CPSU—whose draft was approved today by the more than 300 participants in the conference who have traveled to Bykovo from almost 50 towns throughout our country. The movement of supporters of the Marxist Platform of the CPSU unites party members who stand on Marxist positions, and the aim of this movement is to assist the rebirth of the party and the trust of the working people through unpaid work by communists on practical support for democratic public initiatives advocating a socialist future and a communist outlook and the radical democratization of the party and society. I invite Vladislav Aleksandrovich Pshenikov and Aleksey Alekseyevich Prigarin, members of the organizing committee for preparing and holding the conference, to talk about the next tasks for supporters of the Marxist Platform.

[Pshennikov] The participants in the Marxist Platform do not claim to be forming a faction in the CPSU. They represent an ideological current and their goal is to place our platform before all party members for judgment.

[Korablev] Vladislav Aleksandrovich. What is your attitude to the draft platform of the CPSU Central Committee for the 28th congress?

[Pshennikov] Our platform has arisen because the platform of the CPSU Central Committee does not contain answers to a number of questions concerning our society and which are of real interest.

[Korablev] How much does your platform differ from the draft platform of the CPSU Central Committee on the most important points?

[Pshennikov] The party members will obviously judge how much it differs, but we assume that it does not differ in essence from the platform of the CPSU Central Committee. Essentially, it supplements it.

[Korablev] The participants in the conference are presently discussing a draft resolution on an open letter to the CPSU Central Committee and the country's communists. How does the Council of the Federation of Marxist Party Clubs assess this letter?

[Pshennikov] We disagree with many of the things said by the leaders of the Democratic Platform, but we are in favor of all members of the party being able to freely

determine their own positions ideologically in the course of party discussion. Therefore, we are against the adoption of any organizational measures with regard to the participants in any other platforms, even if we do not agree with them, in the course of party discussion.

[Prigarin] In my opinion, the Central Committee of the party is at least six months late in distancing itself ideologically from the Democratic Platform in the CPSU. But it must be taken into account here that the Democratic Platform has now drawn in a large number of supporters, sincere communists, who have been attracted by general democratic slogans which are there also because the Central Committee is late in democratizing the party, and a different attitude must be taken towards the participants in the Democratic Platform. I am therefore in favor of a clear ideological separation. I am against the adoption of organizational measures against sincere communists.

[Korablev] Aleksey Alekseyevich. What are the main tasks of the Marxist Platform during preparations for the 28th party congress?

[Pshennikov] We must now propagandize to the maximum degree the ideas of Marxism in order to counteract social democratic and liberal bourgeois tendencies, simply, both in society and within the party. [end recording]

### Shevardnadze Interviewed on 'View' Program

*LD1404224590 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1835 GMT 13 Apr 90*

[Interview with Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze to A. Lyubimov and A. Shipilov while on board an aircraft during his March 1990 tour of Africa—recorded; from the "View" program]

[Text] [Lyubimov] Eduard Amvrosiyevich, do you ever feel jealous that while you are the main workhorse, as it were, of our whole foreign policy, our new thinking is attributed to Gorbachev and he gets all the credit? You are always traveling about, but Gorbachev gets all the credit.

[Shevardnadze] No. It's our great fortune, you know, to have a man in whom people believe. It's not only a matter of personality: We now have a man with whom definite hopes are associated. Socialism, the old face of socialism [words indistinct], it is compromised. They are seeking new solutions, new paths... which direction should they take? And much is now... [changes thought] to be blunt about it, all our hopes are pinned on perestroyka and naturally with those people, with the man, who has led this struggle. So one should not be surprised that many things really are being linked to Mikhail Sergeyevich.

How should we now act? To abandon the Third World, as some are advising, would be a gross political mistake, a major error for which future generations would not forgive us, because that world is going to develop and in the next century, the 21st century, the Third World will of course play its role. We must, therefore, build new relations on new principles, and this is possible.

[Shipilov] The traditional perception of diplomacy is connected with Mercedes cars, receptions, diplomats all dressed up in tailcoats and, well, it's traditionally thought that diplomacy merely consumes resources. Is there any material expression of the benefits it brings? Could we talk about this?

[Shevardnadze] You know, the cars are beside the point. There are certain elements of etiquette here that one must take into account. There are certain considerations of state prestige, but this is not the most important thing. I would put it as follows: If one is to talk about profitability, to talk in economic terms, foreign policy is the most profitable industry of all. Let's add it up. We have now succeeded in concluding an agreement with the Americans on Medium- and shorter-range missiles. Has anyone calculated what this means for the economy? Rough calculations have been made: In 12 to 18 months' time, when we complete this liquidation process, we will start reaping the benefits. What will these be? Half a billion in a year or two, then 600 million, 700 million, and then up to a billion (?each year), and so on.

Then you must take into account the fact that these production capacities are being switched to manufacture other products. These are production capacities capable of making, of manufacturing the very latest equipment for the food industry, for light industry, for machine-building, and so on and so forth.

How much did the confrontation with China cost? Serious miscalculations and errors were committed then, but we have managed to normalize relations. We are now holding talks on overcoming the military confrontation with China. We have built up this whole military infrastructure along that enormous border, 7,500 km. Just look at the military settlements and so on, the garrisons and all the rest. All that is Soviet money, our people's money. In the past we believed that it all had to be built; it cost tens of billions if not more, if not hundreds.

We have stopped producing chemical weapons. The problem now, the dilemma for us is how to destroy those tens of thousands of tonnes. We could have stopped that production not last year but way back in 1968 or 1969 when the Americans ceased their production. How much have we spent on creating that potential, so to speak, something that was in fact unnecessary? Except that now we have to destroy it. This is also a matter of tens of billions. To continue, the reduction of conventional arms in Europe is in prospect and that also means tens of billions.

That's what foreign policy means. It has saved, I emphasize, tens and hundreds of billions. A sensible and correct foreign policy.

If we make mistakes in our foreign policy it costs the state and the people very dearly. We sent troops into Czechoslovakia in 1968—who can now calculate how much that cost our people, apart from the political costs at the time and the political damage? Or else the Hungarian events and much more besides. What we wanted—I don't want my military colleagues and so on to take offense at this—we were preparing [word indistinct] to do battle virtually with everyone, with the entire world: with the United States, with China, with Japan, with Western Europe and all the rest. But life isn't like that, and for that reason, to be frank, we brought the country to ruin.

[Lyubimov] Eduard Amvrosiyevich, which country do you think is closest to the human ideal in its state structure?

[Shevardnadze] It's hard for me to name such a country. We are endeavoring to create one, but as for what the new society will be like, as I said once in the United States, it will be a synthesis of all that civilization has achieved. I don't know what it will be called. If we manage to put this into effect in our country it would be ideal.

[Lyubimov] Is the main quality of a politician cynicism?

[Shipilov] President Roosevelt used to say about Somosa that he was a son-of-a-bitch but he was our son-of-a-bitch. We are now learning more and more about the leaders of other countries that figured among our friends, but unfortunately we are forced to acknowledge that we evidently also paid tribute to that approach.

[Shevardnadze] All the same, I think that the main quality of any politican is a sense of realism, a sense of realism.

[Lyubimov] What's your favorite food?

[Shevardnadze] It's hard to say. I'm not capricious in that respect. I'm not choosey.

[Shipilov] We've been told that you are a man who, in effect, is almost incapable of relaxing, because—and this perhaps even offends those around you—as soon as it turns out by chance that you have two or three free hours you look for something to do and are anxious to get down to work. Is that true?

[Shevardnadze] It might sound immodest, but I work (?relatively) hard, like all my colleagues, from Mikhail Sergeyevich, who works a great deal....

[Lyubimov] What time do you get up?

[Shevardnadze] As a rule at 0700. But when I'm on foreign trips I sometimes have to get up at 0500, and sometimes I don't sleep at all because I have to prepare. Seven countries in eight days, so to speak—different presidents, different prime ministers, ministers, different subjects, different problems. Naturally one has to prepare.

[Shipilov] Once in an interview you said that you maintain not only good businesslike relations but also purely personal friendships with many of your foreign counterparts. But what happens when they retire? Do the relationships continue, and who are you perhaps closest to?

[Shevardnadze] To many people, in particular George Shultz. He and I had a special relationship. We met more than 30 times. You know what those meetings were like, not only... they were negotiations, most complex and difficult. Like advanced mathematics, if I can put it that way.

[indistinct remark by Shipilov]

[Shevardnadze] Yes, we had wonderful personal contacts, personal relations. A few months ago I was in New York and George turned up with his family, with his wife and children. We met, sat together a while, talked about politics, recalled a great deal about how we began working together in Helsinki and how many meetings and dramatic situations there had been. That friendship and the correspondence continue. Our children are acquainted and also write to one another.

[Lyubimov] You mix with the political and intellectual elite of the entire world. You then return home and go to meetings of the Politburo and the Supreme Soviet. Does it ever make you sad?

[Shevardnadze] No. I think that our country has stepped out very boldly and that we have taken a very important and serious step. You know, I have been... I take a special interest in these matters. I visited the British parliament, the House of Commons, where Mrs. Thatcher was answering questions. Quite recently I was specially invited by the Canadian parliament to attend and make a visit. I think they can only envy our parliament. I am told that there are very often empty halls there, so to speak, while here we have disputes, heated disputes, free discussions, free debates, free criticism of the leadership, the government, ministries, and local bodies. I think we are on the right path, on the right path.

[Lyubimov] When foreign policy issues are submitted for discussion in the Politburo, who normally takes part?

[Shevardnadze] Everyone takes part when major problems are being tackled, and not only the Politburo. I want you to know that we take a very responsible approach to all decisions in the foreign policy sphere, together with academics, our military colleagues, our military industry, so to speak, and other specialists, as well as diplomats, naturally. In the Politburo everyone takes part, but since Aleksandr Nikolayevich Yakovlev is engaged in foreign policy issues we very often sit together and consult on individual issues. It's not really a word I like to use but the chief conductor in the end is Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev. It's very easy to work with him and to discuss any issue, to object and argue the opposite and to discuss things in a genuinely free and comradely atmosphere. This is a great achievement.

[Lyubimov] Do you think the minister of foreign affairs has to be a member of the Politburo so that his position is stronger in the leadership?

[Shevardnadze] That I don't know. It depends on the wishes of the party, whatever decision they might take. For the moment I am a member of the Politburo.

[Lyubimov] When are Politburo meetings held and how long do they last?

[Shevadnadze] I was a candidate member of the Politburo under Leonid Ilich Brezhnev and I remember sometimes being invited from the periphery—they didn't always summon me, but sometimes I was invited. I recall that very important issues were discussed and the meetings ended, I mean lasted, for only 30-40 minutes. national-economic plans, the country's development, and so on. That's what things were like, to our misfortune.

[Lyubimov] And nowadays?

[Shevardnadze] Nowadays we start at 1100 and generally end at 2100 or 2200.

[Lyubimov] Without a break?

[Shevardnadze] With a short break.

[Shipilov] And how many issues do you study?

[Shevardnadze] A lot. There are no restrictions. We have no strict time limits. We speak as much as we consider necessary. We discuss all the issues thoroughly and all the comrades take part.

[Lyubimov] Do you meet in the Kremlin? Are the Politburo meetings held in the Kremlin or at Staraya Ploshchad [Central Committee building]?

[Shevardnadze] Mainly in the Kremlin, but sometimes at Staraya Ploshchad, but that's unimportant.

[Shipilov] What's the main obstacle? Why have we achieved so little in five years?

[Shevardnadze] No, we have achieved a great deal. It is my profound conviction that we have now created a relatively optimal economic mechanism. But in order to shape a mechanism laws are needed, and you know how much time was spent preparing those laws—the law on property, the law on land, production relations, production collective, and so on. They are not universal, of course, and they have certain shortcomings and so on, but there could be no question of a new economic mechanism without them. And I think that we shall obtain serious returns in a year or two. I guess we have to be patient [words indistinct].

As regards political reform, of the political system, I think we have managed to do a great deal. It's a revolution, a real revolution. A revolution of minds and in practice.

[Shipilov] Do you have political enemies? And if so, who are they?

[Shevardnadze] There is not a single person I could name. I am not by nature a confrontational person, so I do not seek, I neither have nor seek enemies, and my wish is to find a common language with people. I think this is now the main task for our society. I don't want to divide people, you know, especially within the country into an enemy category or camp, so to speak, on the one hand, and the leadership or party members on the other. We are a single society and we must endeavor to consolidate our society. This is what I see as my chief task. There are, of course, people with whom we argue, with whom I disagree, but that is my business.

[(Kraminov)] Eduard Amvrosyevich, you have held this office for almost five years. Has there ever been a point at which you were ready to resign?

[Shevardnadze] [Long pause] There was one moment. When the Congress of People's Deputies was discussing the question of events in Tbilisi. I have spoke of this. I was ready then, after having listened to the speech of the prosecutor, the procurator...[pauses] I really got to the stage...[pauses] of losing my equilibrium. Why? Because when I went to Tbilisi I promised the people that I would do all I could to establish the truth, the truth. And when people speak falsehoods, that is the worst thing. That is intolerable. Particularly in our times. Therefore, I was terribly and deeply upset then, I want to say this quite frankly: Were it not for Mikhail Sergeyevich, I would not have remained.

If perestroyka doesn't work out—I said this at the plenum and it was published—if perestroyka doesn't work out, if we don't manage to bring the democratic processes to a conclusion, there will definitely be a dictator, a dictatorship. I can't envisage anything else. So we must cherish these processes, they have to be cherished, intensified and expanded. Support must be given to everyone, and in the first place to Comrade Gorbachev who has led this struggle, who began, so to speak, this process, this revolutionary process. I know well how difficult it was at the beginning; it was a difficult decision. This is a serious, a very serious issue, but we need bold people, we need solid support for everything that is now progressive in our affairs. The correct and right choice has been made, the only answer. I was asked today if [words indistinct]. When we were still working everything out and starting the perestroyka, we came up against difficulties and probably were not able to foresee them; it's true, we didn't know eveything about the problems we would come up against. As for the other part of that question—If you were now beginning perestroyka, how would you act—I replied that I would do exactly the same as in April 1985. There was no other alternative. The correct choice has been made.

## Press Attache on Government, TASS Statements

*LD1504131190 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1835 GMT 13 Apr 90*

[Interview with Vitaliy Churkin, adviser to USSR minister of foreign affairs, by unidentified correspondent, on board an aircraft during Shevardnadze's March 1990 tour of Africa—recorded; from the "View" program]

[Text] [Churkin] I am a kind of press attache for the minister of foreign affairs, his representative in dealings with the mass media. I hold briefings for journalists. Generally speaking, anything to do with the press and relations with it is my responsibility.

As far as TASS statements are concerned, when they are issued in Moscow, the work is done by a very wide variety of people; those people who are connected with this or that section of work in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. In general it would be going too far to say that I write this or that, since this is work which passes through a number of stages. Ultimately, the author is the minister of foreign affairs, if the statement is important enough. But in different instances different people take part in the preparation.

[Correspondent] What is the difference between a Soviet Government statement, a TASS statement, and a USSR Foreign Ministry statement?

[Churkin] They carry different weight. A Soviet Government statement is the weightiest. A statement by the USSR Foreign Ministry is a step down, of course. Statements by a representative of the USSR Foreign Ministry are lower still. TASS statements are three-quarters official. In terms of weight they are lower on the scale than, say, a statement by a representative, by the USSR Foreign Ministry.

[Correspondent] There are cases where journalists are used to leak information. This gives a minister involved in talks the opportunity to refer to these articles and play these cards in international relations, that is, to use journalists for the tactical regrouping of forces and so on. Are you involved in this or not?

[Churkin] No, I have not been involved in such things, not to the extent that this has been directly used at the foreign minister's talks. Well, I can reveal that, in individual cases, we provide information in which we have an interest. But not in a direct way, not by direct statements, but more obliquely, through various reports by journalists. But I must say that, in general, our diplomatic position has now been reinforced as a result of the development of glasnost, democratization, and the active work of our parliament. Before, when we held talks with the Americans, for example, we were often told: "OK, we agree with what you are saying, but our Senate, the Congress, will never agree to it." We did not have this argument at our disposal. Now, we can tell, the minister can tell our negotiating partners: "Look, you have to understand that we have a parliament and public opinion. I cannot agree with your proposal."

This strengthens our hand. It shows that, although democracy—unlike when it is absent—makes politics more one-dimensional and tougher, in a way, it also makes it possible to conduct politics in a more flexible, and therefore, more effective way.

## Biographic Notes on Presidential Council Members

*90UN1343A Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 29 Mar 90 Morning Edition pp 1-2*

[Unattributed report accompanied by photographs: "Members of the USSR Presidential Council"]

[Text] **Aytmatov, Chingiz**

Born in 1928. Kirghiz. Member of the CPSU since 1959. Education—higher. Graduated from the Kirghiz Agricultural Institute, finished higher literary courses of the USSR Union of Writers.

Chingiz Aytmatov is a writer with a world reputation, the author of the novels and tales "Dzhamiliya," "The White Steamship," "Farewell, Gulsary!" "And the Day Lasts Longer Than a Century," "The Block," and others.

Chingiz Aytmatov is a major public figure and the founder of the "Issyk-Kul Forum," which sponsors the meetings of intellectuals—writers, scholars, and public figures—to discuss the problems of modern culture. He is an academician of the Kirghiz SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Academy of Sciences as well as an honorary member of international academies—the World and European Academies.

He is chairman of the board of the Kirghiz SSR Union of Writers and chief editor of the journal INOSTRANNAYA LITERATURA.

Ch. Aytmatov is a USSR people's deputy, a member of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and chairman of the Commission on the Development of Culture, Language, and National and International Traditions and the Preservation of the Historical Heritage under the Council of Nationalities.

Winner of the Lenin Prize and the USSR State Prizes. Hero of Socialist Labor.

**Bakatin, Vadim Viktorovich**

Born in 1937. Russian. Member of the CPSU since 1964. Graduated from the Novosibirsk Construction Engineering Institute and the Academy of Social Sciences under the CPSU Central Committee.

He began his professional career in 1960 as foreman of the construction board of the "Kemerovokhimstroy" trust. Then he became head of a section and chief engineer of a house-building plant in the city of Kemerovo.

In 1973 in his party career he became second secretary of the Kemerovo Gorkom [city party committee], department head, and secretary of the Kemerovo Obkom

[oblast party committee]. In 1983 he became inspector of the CPSU Central Committee. In 1985 he was made first secretary of the Kirov CPSU Obkom. In 1987—first secretary of the Kemerovo CPSU Obkom. In 1988—USSR minister of internal affairs. He has been a member of the CPSU Central Committee since 1986.

**Boldin, Valeriy Ivanovich**

Born in 1935. Russian. Member of the CPSU since 1960. Graduated from the economics department of the Moscow Agricultural Academy imeni K.A. Timiryazev and the Academy of Social Sciences under the CPSU Central Committee. He has published a number of scientific works.

He began his professional career in 1953 as a radio electrician at a signalling division on the Moscow-Ryazan railway line. In 1960 he worked as a literary associate on the editorial board of the newspaper PRAVDA. From 1961 to 1965 he worked in the apparat of the CPSU Central Committee. In 1969 he became economics correspondent, agricultural editor of PRAVDA, and member of the editorial board. He held a second position teaching with the Higher Economics Courses under the USSR State Planning Committee.

In 1981 he became assistant to the secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. In 1985—assistant to the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. In 1987—head of the General Department of the CPSU Central Committee. From 1986-1988 he was a candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee. In 1988 he was made a member of the CPSU Central Committee. In the November 1988 Central Committee Plenum he was confirmed as a member of the CPSU Central Committee Party Building and Cadre Policy Commission.
He is a USSR people's deputy.

**Kauls, Albert Ernestovich**

Born in 1938 in the village of Skrunda in Kuldigskiy Rayon of the Latvian SSR to the family of a laborer. Latvian. Member of the CPSU since 1960.

He began his professional career in 1953 as a laborer. From June to November 1957 he was an instructor at the Skrundskiy Raykom [rayon party committee] of the Latvian Komsomol. He served in the Soviet Army from November 1957 to April 1958. After his discharge he studied at the Riga Soviet Party School under the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee, was qualified as a junior agricultural committee organizer, and was appointed department manager at the "Saliena" sovkhoz [state farm] of Rizhskiy Rayon. In 1963 he was elected first secretary of the Rizhskiy Raykom of the Latvian Komsomol. In 1964 he became chairman of the "Lenika Tselsh" kolkhoz [collective farm] in Rizhskiy Rayon. In 1970 after graduating from the Vilnius Higher Party School, he was elected chairman of the "Zvertsiyems" kolkhoz of Rizhskiy Rayon. In 1973 he was appointed head of the agricultural administration of Rizhskiy Rayon. In 1974 he was elected chairman of the "Adazhi" kolkhoz, and in 1986 he became chairman of the "Adazhi" agricultural firm.

He is a candidate of the agricultural sciences, corresponding member of the All-Union Academy of Agricultural Sciences imeni V.I. Lenin, and Hero of Socialist Labor.
He is a USSR people's deputy.

**Kryuchkov, Vladimir Aleksandrovich**

Born in 1924 in the city of Volgograd to the family of a laborer. Russian. Graduated from the All-Union Correspondence Legal Institute in 1949 and from the Higher Diplomatic School of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs in 1954.
Member of the USSR since 1944.

He began his professional career in 1941. He worked checking qualifications in the factories of Volgograd and Gorkiy. In 1943 he worked with the Komsomol, and from 1946 to 1951 in the organs of the procuracy of Volgograd Oblast.

In 1954 after graduation from the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs Higher Diplomatic School V.A. Kryuchkov was assigned to diplomatic work. Beginning 1959 he worked in the apparat of the CPSU Central Committee where he was a reader and a sector head.

In 1965 he became assistant to the secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. He has spent the last 23 years in positions of leadership in the USSR KGB: In 1978 he became deputy chairman and in 1988 he became chairman of the USSR KGB. He is a General of the Army.

He became a member of the CPSU Central Committee in 1986. At the September 1989 CPSU Central Committee Plenum he was elected a member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo.

**Maslyukov, Yuriy Dmitriyevich**

Born in 1937 in the city of Leninabad in Tajik SSR to the family of a laborer. Russian. Graduated in 1962 from the Leningrad Mechanical Engineering Institute. Member of the CPSU since 1966.

He began his professional career in 1962 as an engineer at a scientific research institute. He worked at the institute as a senior engineer, deputy department head, and first deputy director and chief engineer. In 1970 he became chief engineer of a branch of the Izhevsk machine-building plant, and later—head of a main technical administration and member of the board, and then USSR deputy minister of the defense industry. In November 1985 he became deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and in February 1988 he became first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the USSR State Planning Committee.

He became a member of the CPSU Central Committee in 1986. At the February 1988 CPSU Central Committee Plenum he was elected candidate member of the Politburo, and at the September 1989 Central Committee Plenum he became a full member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo.

**Osipyan, Yuriy Andreyevich**

Academician, doctor of physical and mathematical sciences, professor, Hero of Socialist Labor, vice president of the USSR Academy of Sciences, and director of the Institute of Solid-State Physics of the USSR Academy of Sciences. Born in 1931 in Moscow. Armenian. Member of the CPSU since 1959.

Academician Yu.A. Osipyan has written more than 150 basic works on a number of areas of solid-state physics which for the most part define modern ideas and directions of further development of both theoretical and applied research in the field of physical material technology. Yu.A. Osipyan is a winner of the gold medal imeni P.N. Lebedev.

Yu.A. Osipyan is major organizer of Soviet science. He has done much work coordinating fundamental and applied research in the USSR, and for more than 20 years he headed the department he organized in the Moscow Physicotechnical Institute. Academic Yu.A. Osipyan is a member of several foreign academies and scientific societies.
He is a USSR people's deputy.

**Primakov, Yevgeniy Maksimovich**

Born in 1929. Spent his childhood and youth in Tbilisi. Russian. Graduated from the Moscow Institute of Oriental Studies in 1953 and finished his graduate study at Moscow State University imeni M.V. Lomonosev in 1956. Doctor of economic sciences and academician of the USSR Academy of Sciences. Member of the CPSU since 1959.

He began his professional career in 1956 as a correspondent of the State Committee for Radio and Television Broadcasting. From 1962 to 1970 he was a correspondent, assistant editor of a department, and special correspondent of the newspaper PRAVDA in the Far East.

In 1970 he began to do scientific work in the system of the USSR Academy of Sciences: He was deputy director of the Institute of World Economics and International Relations, director of the Institute of Oriental Studies, director of the Institute of World Economics and International Relations, and a member of the presidium of the USSR Academy of Sciences.

In 1986-1989 he was a candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee. In April 1989 he became a member of the CPSU Central Committee, and in September he was elected candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo.

He is a USSR people's deputy. From June 1989 to March 1990 he was chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Council of the Union.

**Rasputin, Valentin Grigoryevich**

Born in 1937. Russian. Nonparty. Philologist by education, he graduated from the Irkutsk State University in 1959. Until 1966 he occupied himself with journalism and worked with the Irkutsk and Krasnoyarsk youth press. He began professional literary work in 1965.

V.G. Rasputin is a member of the USSR Union of Writers and a secretary of the board of the Union of USSR and RSFSR Writers. He is the author of the widely known tales and stories "Money for Maria," "The Last Deadline," "Live and Remember," "Goodbye to Mother," "Fire," and other artistic works.

For his literary activities V.G. Rasputin has twice been honored with the USSR State Prize. He has been awarded the title of Hero of Socialist Labor. He is known in the country as an active public figure, the founder of movements to save Lake Baykal and to preserve and increase the natural wealth of Siberia, the Far East, and other regions of the country. He was elected USSR people's deputy, is a member of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee on Ecology and Rational Use of Natural Resources, and is a member of the credentials committee of the USSR Congress of People's Deputies.

**Revenko, Grigoriy Ivanovich**

Born in 1936. Ukrainian. Member of the CPSU since 1962. Graduated from Lvov Polytechnic Institute and the Academy of Social Sciences under the CPSU Central Committee.

He began his professional career in 1958 as an engineer at the Odessa factory for refrigeration engineering. In 1961 he began working with the Komsomol: First secretary of the raykom, secretary, second and first secretary of the Odessa Obkom, and secretary of the Ukrainian Komsomol Central Committee since 1968. In 1972 he became inspector of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee, then secretary and second secretary of the Kiev Obkom. From 1980 to 1984 he was a member of the Ukrainian Communist Party Supreme Soviet Presidium, and chairman of the Ukrainian Communist Party Inspection Committee. In 1984 he became inspector of the CPSU Central Committee and deputy department head of the CPSU Central Committee Party Building and Cadre Work Department.

In 1985 he became first secretary of the Kiev Obkom of the Ukrainian Communist Party. In 1986—member of the CPSU Central Committee. He is a member of the CPSU Central Committee International Policy Commission. He is a candidate member of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee Politburo. He is a USSR people's deputy and a member of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

**Ryzhkov, Nikolay Ivanovich**

Born in 1929 in the village of Dyleyevka in Dzerzhinskiy Rayon of Donetsk Oblast. Russian. Graduated in 1950 from Kramatorskiy machine-building technical secondary school and in 1959 from the Urals Polytechnic Institute imeni S.M. Kirov. Member of the CPSU since 1956.

He began his professional career in 1950 at "Uralmash" as a shift foreman. In the following years he worked at that factory as head of a bay, head of a shop, chief welder, deputy director, and in 1965 he became chief engineer. In 1970 he became director of the Urals heavy engineering industry factory imeni S. Ordzhonikidze. In 1971-1975 he was general director of the "Uralmash" production association. In 1975 he became first secretary of the USSR Ministry of Heavy and Transport Machine Building, and in 1979—first deputy chairman of the USSR State Planning Committee. In 1982-1985 he was secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and head of the CPSU Central Committee Economic Department. In September 1985 he was appointed chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers.

In 1981 he became a member of the CPSU Central Committee. In April 1985 he was elected a member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo.
He is a USSR people's deputy.

**Shatalin, Stanislav Sergeyevich**

Born in 1934 in the city of Pushkin in Leningrad Oblast. Russian. Graduated from the economics department of Moscow State University. Doctor of economic sciences and academician of the USSR Academy of Sciences. Member of the CPSU since 1963.

As the leader of large scientific collectives in the system of the USSR Academy of Sciences, the State Committee for Science and Technology, and Moscow State University, S.S. Shatalin has made a great contribution to the development of a theory of the optimal functioning of a socialist economy and the modeling and prediction of processes of the national economy. Academician Shatalin played a conspicuous role in the design of one the most important trends in the development of Soviet economic science—the theory and methodology of the balance of the socialist economy. In 1968 he was awarded the USSR State Prize for designing accountable and systematic interbranch balances.

S.S. Shatalin is taking an active part in the design of a composite program of the USSR's scientific and technical progress. He is chairman of the problem-solving committee "Social Problems, Increasing the Public's Welfare, and the Development of Culture in the USSR" and chairman of the Scientific Council of the USSR Academy of Sciences on the composite problem "Social and Cultural Development." In 1989 he began to execute the duties of academician-secretary of the Department of Economics at the USSR Academy of Sciences.

**Shevardnadze, Eduard Amvrosiyevich**

Born in 1928 in the village of Mamati in Lanchkhutskiy Rayon of the Georgian SSR. Georgian. Graduated from the Kutaisi State Pedagogical Institute. Member of the CPSU since 1948.

He began work with the Komsomol in 1946, and in 1957 he was simultaneously first secretary of the Georgian Komsomol Central Committee and a member of the All-Union Komsomol Central Committee bureau.

In 1961 he began work with the party: first secretary of Mkhtsetskiy Raykom and then first secretary of the Pervomayskiy Raykom of the Georgian Communist Party of the city of Tbilisi.

In 1964 he became deputy minister and in 1965 minister of maintenance of public order of the Georgian SSR.

In 1972 he was elected first secretary of the Tbilisi Gorkom. In 1972-1985 he was first secretary of the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee. In July 1985 he became USSR minister of foreign affairs.

In 1976 he became a member of the CPSU Central Committee. In 1978 he was elected candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo. In July 1985 he became a full member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo. He is a Hero of Socialist Labor.

**Yazov, Dmitriy Timofeyevich**

Born in 1923 in the village of Yazov of Okoneshnikovskiy Rayon in Omsk Oblast. Russian. Graduated from the Military Academy imeni M.V. Frunze, and the Military Academy of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff. General of the Army. Member of the CPSU since 1944.

He has served in the Soviet Army since 1941. He fought in the Great Patriotic War. In the postwar period he was commander of a company, a battalion, and a regiment, and he occupied various staff positions. Starting in 1967 he became the commander of a division and then an army corps, an army commander, first deputy commander of the Far East Military District, and commander of the Central Group of Forces. In 1980 he became commander of the Central Asia Military District, and in 1984—commander of the Far East Military District. In January 1987 he became deputy minister and in May 1987 minister of defense of the USSR.

In 1981 he was elected candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee and in 1987 member of the CPSU Central Committee. In June 1987 he was elected candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo.

**Yakovlev, Aleksandr Nikolayevich**

Born in 1923 in the village of Korolevo in Yaroslavskiy Rayon of Yaroslavl Oblast to the family of a peasant. Graduated from Yaroslavl State Pedagogical Institute

and the Academy of Social Sciences under the CPSU Central Committee. Corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences. Member of the CPSU since 1944.

He served in the Soviet Army 1941-1943. He fought in the Great Patriotic War. He did party and journalistic work beginning in 1946. Beginning in 1953 (with a break for studies at the Academy of Social Sciences under the CPSU Central Committee 1956-1960) he worked in the apparat of the CPSU Central Committee: Instructor, sector head, first deputy head of the Propaganda Department.

In 1973-1983 he was ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary of the USSR to Canada. In 1983 he became director of the Institute of World Economics and International Relations of the USSR Academy of Sciences.

In 1985 he became head of the CPSU Central Committee Propaganda Department. In March 1986 he became secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. At the September 1988 Central Committee Plenum he was approved as chairman of the CPSU Central Committee International Policy Commission.

He is the author of monographs and articles on problems of history, politics, culture, and international relations.

In 1986 he became member of the CPSU Central Committee. In January 1987 he was elected candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo. In June 1987 he became a full member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo.
He is a USSR people's deputy.

**Yarin, Veniamin Aleksandrovich**

Born in 1940, Russian, member of the CPSU since 1969, higher education.

He began to work in construction at 17 years of age. In 1959 he began to work at the Nizhnetagilskiy metallurgical plant imeni V.I. Lenin where he progressed from an odd-job man to senior operator of the management posts at mill No. 650.

In March 1989 he was elected USSR people's deputy from Nizhnetagilskiy territorial district No. 302 of Sverdlovsk Oblast. He is a member of the USSR Supreme Soviet. He is a member of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee on Women and Preservation of the Family, Maternity, and Childhood.

## Economist Says Communist Party Split 'Inevitable'

*PM0204135490*

[Editorial Report] London BBC Television Network in English at 2130 GMT on 30 March carries interviews with Professor Aleksey Shulus, an economist from the Institute of the Trade Union Movement, and Dr. Robert Service of London University, a biographer of Lenin, during a Jeremy Harris video report on Lenin's position in the current political climate in the USSR.

On Gorbachev's view of Lenin, Shulus tells Harris: "I'm afraid that now we are moving from interpretation of Lenin's works like an icon to another distortion—and now a social democratic one. So I think now we are trying to make Lenin look like a social democrat, not like a communist."

Harris reports that as the Soviet Union moves toward a multiparty system, "having Lenin—the architect of the one-party state—at his shoulder could prove an electoral liability for Gorbachev." Service acknowledges that "This campaign of abandoning Lenin by stealth might proceed for a few more months, but it may be necessary to completely rethink the October Revolution, and when that happens, then a full frontal reconsideration of Lenin in history and Lenin in Soviet politics today will have to be attempted. And at that point it may be that Gorbachev dumps Lenin."

Shulus says: "For the party that means, I think, the inevitable split of the Communist Party because the Leninist wing—which is called the dogmatic, conservative wing, but I think it's a Leninist wing—this wing will be forced to leave the party, because they are the minority. So they will be forced to leave the party and form their own party, maybe the Russian Communist Party—so the same name as it was in Lenin times. As far as Gorbachev is concerned, well, I think he's facing serious political troubles."

## Officers Assembly Backs Soyuz Deputies' Stance

*PM0604111590 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 5 Apr 90 First Edition p 1*

[Report by Lieutenant Colonel V. Kharchenko, chairman of the unit Officers' Assembly, Northern Group of Forces: "We Share the 'Soyuz' Stance"]

[Text] Perhaps never before has such a pitch of feeling, such openness of opinion been witnessed in our Officers' Assembly. It was the publication of the political platform of the "Soyuz" deputies' group in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA that gave rise to this discussion.

In sum, I can say that the unit collective supports and shares the deputy group's platform and considers that it meets the interests of our society and state. We, too, are concerned about the fate of the federation and are alarmed that separatist forces not just in the Baltic but also in other regions of the country are actively working to split our multinational state.

In recent years whenever the induction of the young generation takes place officers have experienced an understandable sense of disquiet. Of course we are glad that fresh forces are entering the formations. But, on the other hand, one cannot help but see the kind of nationalist quirks that are being simultanously introduced into the garrisons. Here you sometimes get the feeling that

schools and vocational and technical colleges have altogether forgotten about the international education of young people.

Take the problem of learning Russian in national schools. This was also discussed at our assembly. Many agreed with Senior Lieutenant M. Kenzhisariyev—it seem that the study of the language of interethnic communication is being blatantly sabotaged in a number of regions, and deliberately so. In this regard "Soyuz's" readiness to resolutely advocate the recognition of Russian as the official language throughout the USSR is bound to impress us military men. In the Army it is not just a means of communication and a means of molding sound military collectives; it also serves as the basis of command and the organization of troop coordination.

My colleagues note with understandable alarm the escalating anti-Army mood in society and the desire gradually to set the Army and the people against each other and drive a wedge between them and to turn servicemen from an active, political, and social force into an amorphous, featureless mass. Are not the irresponsible calls to boycott military candidates in the elections to republic and local soviets to be explained by these desires? There are forces in society which require an unthinking, submissive army that is indifferent to the fate of those who send their sons to serve in it. That cannot be allowed. The army is not simply made up of people, it is made up of citizens, citizens of a country toward whose fate they are not indifferent. Its ills and misfortunes are not foreign to it, they are our own ills and misfortunes. Proof of this abounds.

The "Soyuz" deputies' group plans to assist and support military collectives and all those who feel anxious about the fate and the future of our multinational union. And not without reason. We are with you, internationalist deputies!

## Biryukova Expounds on Drug Problems

*LD1504085390 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0030 GMT 15 Apr 90*

[Text] As has already been reported, an international conference on cocaine and reducing the demand for drugs has been held in London. The Soviet delegation at this meeting was headed by Aleksandra Pavlovna Biryukova, CPSU Central Committee Politburo candidate member and deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers. Our correspondent (Andrey Sosney) has spoken with her. Here is a recording:

[Begin recording] [(Sosney)] Aleksandra Pavlovna, this is the fist time that the Soviet Union has sent such an imposing delegation at such a high level to partipate in such a conference.

[Biryukova] We participate in all conferences and all international forums which examine the problem of fighting drugs. The present conference has a certain other aim, in the sense that this conference is international and on reducing the demand for drugs and fighting the cocaine threat. Up to now the basic efforts at national and international level have been concentrated on increasing control over drugs, the fight against the illegal trade in them, and the struggle with the drugs business. However, it has not been possible to achieve decisive successes either in our country or in the world community. And chiefly it has not been possible to achieve these decisive successes because we fought against the results, not against the causes and symptoms of the illnesses which cause them.

[(Sosney)] How did you put forward our new position in approaching this problem at the conference?

[Biryukova] The direction, in the opinion of the Soviet delegation, which we expounded, must be made real by a strategy of reducing the demand for drugs. In the first place we proceed from the fact that drug addition is born from the social and cultural conditions of life, and only then from the coca and poppy plantations and the chemical laboratories. In our opinion it is necessary to turn to face man directly and investigate in depth what it is precisely in his communal environment, in his own individual (? make-up), in his spiritual environment, which causes a craving for drugs. Here the efforts of representatives of a great variety of scientific disciplines and representatives from the public must be united, but of course the community, the state, and politicians have the deciding word. It is on their efforts, in the end, that the formation of a whole set of conditions that would exclude a mass desire for drugs depends. The paramount role belongs here to the family and schools, that is, those social institutions where the basis of character and the basis for behavior, habits, orientation in life and a feeling of personal responsibility and disipline are laid down. A huge responsibility for the fight against drugs is borne by figures active in literature, art, and the mass media.

[(Sosney)] To what extent did the position which you have just expounded meet with understanding at the conference, that is how did it correspond to the positions of other countries?

[Biryukova] We came out with this position together with many of those international currents existing at present. And in the speech of UK Prime Minister Mrs. Margaret Thatcher, who was one of the organizers of this international conference, and in the speeches of representatives in particular from Western European countries, this very position received not only extremely wide support, but was also developed, and this position was reflected in the political declaration on reducing the demand for drugs, the now so-called London declaration, which in essence was adopted unanimously at this conference.

[(Sosney)] Could you name the main points of this declaration, what program of action is envisaged.

[Biryukova] It recommends that national governments and the governments of countries where it is considered

vital to fight drugs and for a reduction in the demand for drugs, should create an all-government program. [end recording]

### Freedom of Conscience Bill Examined

*PM1204135990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Apr 90 Second Edition p 2*

[TASS report: "In USSR Council of Ministers Presidium"]

[Text] On 11 April the USSR Council of Ministers Presidium examined the USSR draft law on freedom of conscience and religious organizations. The draft proceeds from Lenin's 1918 decree "on separating the church from the state and the school from the church" and reflects the changes which have taken place in the country over the years of Soviet power and the features of the present stage of socialist society's development.

The draft considers new approaches toward state-church relations which accord with the essence and spirit of perestroyka. It has reflected acts of international law including the final document of the Vienna meeting of states taking part in the CSCE (1989).

During the discussion it was noted that the first single all-union draft law to be elaborated enshrines and develops the provisions of the USSR Constitution on freedom of conscience and citizens' equality in all spheres of society's life irrespective of their attitude toward religion. It enshrines the norms of existing legislation on responsibility for their violation and for preaching hatred and offending citizens' feelings in connection with their religious or atheistic persuasions.

Legal foundations are being created for religious organizations' participation in social dialogue and in their charitable activity. Legal, property, and financial rights of religious organizations and their mutual relations with the central and republican organs of management and local soviets of people's deputies are defined.

These and other provisions of the draft law are aimed at expanding citizens' rights and freedoms and strengthening democratic and humanist principles of socialist society as it is being renewed.

The draft law, finalized with a consideration for the remarks and proposals expressed, will be submitted by the government to the USSR Supreme Soviet.

### Christian Democratic Movement Founded

*LD1404191790 Moscow TASS in English 1904 GMT 14 Apr 90*

[By TASS correspondent Boris Aksyonov]

[Text] Moscow April 14 TASS—The Russian Christian Democratic Movement held its constituent conference in Moscow recently. The motto of the new public organisation is "to transform the world on the basis of Christian morality".

The movement unites supporters of dramatic changes in all spheres of the country's life. It comes out for giving up communist ideology as the official ideology of the state, favors parliamentary democracy, supports independent cultural, public and professional organizations, the independence of judicial authorities, the observance of human rights and freedoms, as well as the freedom of conscience. In the economic sphere, the movement favours the deideologization of the state's economic policy and equal rights for all forms of property, including private property.

Gleb Anishchenko, co-chairman of the movement, said that three out of 15 members of the Duma (its steering body) are people's deputies to Russia's parliament. They intend to form a Christian democratic group in the republican parliament within the framework of the "Democratic Russia" bloc.

In all the times Christians participated in political life in this or that form, Cyacheslav Polosin, a priest, people's deputy and another co-chairman of the movement, recalled. This is why at present, when a multi-party system is being established in the country, Christians should have a say in parliament. They should become a political bulwark for the protection of basic human freedoms, thus preventing any type of a totalitarian regime to seize power.

At present the membership of the movement is not clear, because its members have not been registered so far. In principle, it can rally both individual and collective members, including our compatriots living abroad. The movement seeks to represent believers from Russia, but it does not rule out possible participation of people from other republics in its work. There are representatives of Odessa and Riga in the Duma.

Activists of the movement support contacts with Christian democrats from Western countries and establish relations with similar movements in other Soviet republics. They are going to apply for official registration soon.

Leaders of the movement support contacts with Christian democrats from Western countries and establish relations with similar movements in other Soviet republics. They are going to apply for official registration soon.

Leaders of the movement told journalists that they disagreed in principle with the Democratic Union and Pamyat organizations. "We reject any extremism, be it right-wing or left-wing," Vyacheslav Polosin said.

### Peace Committee Holds Moscow Roundtable

*LD1104165390*

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1330 GMT on 11 April broadcasts an announcer-read report on a roundtable meeting of the Peace Committee held in Moscow on an unspecified date.

The announcer lists new political movements and parties represented at the meeting:

CPSU, CPSU on a Democratic Platform, Liberal-Democratic Party, Union of Constitutional Democrats, Democratic Party, Russian People's Front, Russian Democratic Party, Party of the Greens, Russian Christian Democratic Party, "Shchit" (Shield) Organization, Russian Union of Young Democrats, Social Democratic Association, Soviet Party and Russian Committee for Rights of Man. The Democratic Union and National Patriots appear for the meeting.

The announcer says correspondent Shakhnovich reports that the representatives spent two hours speaking of the history and platform of their parties. Representatives from the CPSU urged them to seek what they have in common, not differences. The standard of speeches vary. Many of the parties only started up this year.

Aleksandr Ivanovich Nikitin, secretary of the Soviet Peace Committee, director of the Center of Political and International Research, is interviewed as one of the organizers of the meeting on the importance of dialogue between the movements. The next meeting will discuss interparty relations.

## Former POW Returns Home 13 Apr

*LD1304180590 Moscow TASS in English 1725 GMT 13 Apr 90*

[by TASS correspondent Igor Agabekov]

[Text] Moscow April 13 TASS—Aleksey Tikhonov, a former Soviet army private, has returned home after spending over four years as a captive of Afghan rebels.

Journalists had an opportunity to meet Tikhonov and his parents at the Soviet Peace Foundation today.

Answering numerous questions from correspondents, Aleksey related in detail how he had been taken prisoner and how he had returned home. He heard by radio about the amnesty announced by the Soviet government for all prisoners of war, managed to escape and reach Afghan regular army positions. From there he was sent to the Soviet embassy in Kabul.

Under the aegis of the All-Union Association of Families of Soviet Prisoners of War, Aleksay Tikhonov is the fourth soldier to return home from captivity," [single quotation mark as received] Iona Andronov, chairman of the public organisation and people's deputy of the Russian Federation, said.

"This inspires us in our efforts to bring home all our men in captivity," he said.

Andronov expressed gratitude to the Soviet Peace Foundation, which has sponsored each trip by Soviet public delegations to Afghanistan and Pakistan, and also to the Soviet Defence Ministry.

Upon Tikhonov's return home, he and his parents were received by Soviet Defence Minister Army General Dmitriy Yazov, who congratulated them on the occasion and extended his warmest wishes.

## Case for 'Party of Order' Questioned

*PM1204143790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 11 Apr 90 Morning Edition p 3*

["Viewpoint" article by Doctor of Philosophical Sciences Yuriy Levada: "What Next? Reflections on the Political Situation in the Country"]

[Text] The atmosphere of heated passions that today determines our social existence makes me constantly recall the phrase about the difference between political life and the sidewalk of the Nevskiy Prospekt.

Usually extremely simple explanations are offered for this: somebody's ambitions, the lack of political culture, the traditions either of rallies or of solemn meetings, and so forth. There is indeed plenty of all this, but I think that such allusions explain precisely nothing. There is no politician without personal ambition, no argument without human emotion. The real issue is what social forces, tendencies, and trends are activating people and passions. Outside observers have long since spotted, for instance, that, unlike Western parliamentarians, our deputies do not try to persuade each other but address themselves directly to voters, via television. The point here is by no means the mentality of the speakers, but the present properties of our quasi-parliamentary forms, especially those imposing, ill-organized, rally-like congresses that provide a platform for speeches but are of little use for serious work.

The last congress had to perform the functions of an electoral college, so it would be important to compare the spread of positions in the auditorium with that within society.

The deputies were elected exactly a year (a whole year!) ago, and even then the corps of deputies could have been considered not to fully match the model of society. And the first session showed that society is markedly more "radicalized" than its representatives in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses (special research was carried out, and the data about this were published). A great deal has changed in the country over the past year: Adversarial attitudes and impatience have increased and the polarization of forces and views, the destruction of mythological "monoliths," and the need to reckon with new realities have become obvious. Very clearly, all these changes have affected the congress least of all, or at any rate less than the Supreme Soviet. And the "rally-type" approach (necessary in order to rouse the masses, hated by those who are incapable of doing this, but useless for any organized work) inevitably remains the dominant one there among all currents, factions, and oppositions. Although we will certainly get used to these "terrible" words sooner than we see embodiments of them actually in operation.

The configuration of social forces and the political structure of our pluralism (are we going to admit it or to continue to cling to "informal" organizations?) are changing, and comparisons between the positions of center and "left," center and "right," populists and the apparatus, advocates of universal values and of "only their own" values, and so forth have long been inadequate to describe them. Thus a trend that in terms of political history could be designated the "party of order" for the first time proclaimed its existence at the last congress, and did so extremely vocally. The occasion and the specific individuals and intentions in question are beside the point—today there are increasingly insistent demands that order be imposed in society. Not just on the streets, in shops, and in stores, but in society.

The understandable desperation of the ordinary consumer, nostalgia among the apparatus for a firm hand and unshakable authorities, and, finally—and this is being heard almost more loudly than anything else today—the destruction of the complexes of "great-power consciousness" are all creating a heterogeneous but quite broad field of influence for slogans of order. But even the short "Andropov" period showed that social order cannot be imposed by militia methods, that society lacks elementary order and all there is is summary [summiruyushchiy] order, that is, order that sums up the interests, demands, and norms of action of various forces. Therefore, at the present crucial time the demands for order, elevated to the status of a slogan, signify a call to "freeze" and "put the brakes on" the processes of change. In effect the "party of order" is seeking to fill the place in our political spectrum that routine ideologizing has lost or is losing with every passing day. It may exploit with greater or lesser success the tiredness, confusion, and desperation of various social groups, but it cannot offer society a real way out.

This reality itself is diverse, the specific personal qualities of specific people and the legislative institutions put in place before our very eyes operate within it, along with much else besides. I am mentioning neither of these here primarily because this would require different approaches, knowledge (if this is possible), and qualifications. Moreover, everything is decided differently in unstable, untraditional periods such as our life today.

I would regard the constitutional strivings of the past 18 months or so, which led to the presidency, above all as a series of partly preconceived and partly forced attempts to blow up the ideological and political monolith which was the basis of the numbing supremacy of the bureaucratic system and which convincingly demonstrated its own hopelessness. An entirely earthly, civilian state geared to man and the law was proclaimed in the presidential oath. As in any declaration, here, too, there is recognition of what has already actually happened: The monolith has been blown up, although not entirely.

Many aspects of that event have been elucidated quite well. In this case I would like to point out that the illusion of a beneficial reform from above—rather, with the help of the traditional system of rule—seems to have imperceptibly disappeared in the dust and the crash of the shattering of the old fetters of social thought. Yet just a year or two ago many people in our country and abroad perceived Gorbachev's actions as a fantastic attempt either to create a new society at the hands of the old apparatus or to break that apparatus with his own hands. However, the idea of "presidential absolutism" as a means of making a sensible and smooth transition to a democratic future—an idea put into discussion circulation several months ago—struck me as the direct successor to illusions of that sort. It is possible to perceive in it an interesting polemical method: let us say, for a comparative assessment of the various options for the historical development of democratic forms of organization, or for building a mental experiment, or something of that sort. But there was and is no social reality behind starry-eyed illusions—it cannot be denied. Above all because any system of rule, all the more so in such a huge and complexly organized society as ours, presupposes a multitude of functions, posts, and relations linked by trust, obedience, calculation, habit, etc. The "apparatus" certainly is not a mechanical lever that can be thrown in different directions. It would probably be possible to disband an army by order of the commander, but it would hardly be possible to "disband" a church by means of the pontiff's encyclical—relations there are more complex than simple disciplinary obedience.

So, to continue this line of reasoning, it is possible to picture our situation roughly as follows: When we tried to shift our political apparatus into a different work regime (to move the "lever" in another direction), it simply broke and ceased to function. Of course, this is just a technical metaphor that models a part of reality. The "apparatus" is functioning in all its varieties and trying to influence something and to stimulate itself. But the wheels are increasingly running free, because both the main drive belts—mass confidence and mass fear—have been irretrievably lost. So, having begun his reforming activity by using "old" levers (the power of the general secretary in the party and state mechanism), Gorbachev has simply been forced to seek new—not constitutional formulas, not titles—but precisely new social levers and a new mechanism for constituting society itself. What can this be? This is probably the chief question for our future, and for the very near future at that.

The Soviet, deideologized state with a president, a parliament, a multiparty system, etc., has been proclaimed but still has to be created. There are almost no ready-made "components." Today it is already too late to even dream of the planned dismantling and rational restructuring of the all-embracing party and state mechanism. The processes of disintegration are irreversible, in social systems included.

The country's president has his own, very real authority. This is incontestable. A year ago he was named "man of the year" by 55 percent of the population, and now by 46 percent—which is a lot for the situation in such an

irritated and such a disunited society, particularly as in the public opinion he has no real rivals at all (16 percent for B.N. Yeltsin, for example). The most important point so far has been the fact that at decisive moments Gorbachev has always possessed the initiative and determined decisions; he showed this once again at the Third Congress.

But authority in itself is not identical with power. The president must seek and create for himself support in the new soviets, including the Supreme Soviet, in mass movements, and in new public and political leaders. This is a path which seems incredibly complex today, since disunity and conflicts are growing, and it is hard even to dream of consolidation, albeit only on a very broad all-union platform. Consolidation can be brought nearer only by bringing the "upper" and "lower" currents of social changes closer together.

The obstacles on this path include the obvious and maybe even growing divergence of reference points: Hence the accusations, respectively, of "laggardness" and "running ahead." These words do not express the situation, since movement has, in fact, long been taking place on different levels and at different speeds. The "grass roots" and the forces geared to their support are radicalizing their demands, whereas the "upper echelons" are waging difficult battles of maneuver against a numerically superior "opponent" pressing from the right. Under such conditions, to demand that one group waits while the other gets a move on would be tantamount to trying to persuade an avalanche to move evenly.... Of course it would have been a good thing to adopt reliable laws on ownership, land, freedom of the press, and other things something like two years ago. But at that time the necessary critical mass did not yet exist "there" to push through any decisive acts at all. The evolution of the state and party mechanism would probably have been smoother if the symbolically important "sixth" article had been revised at least a year sooner, but this was still impossible three months ago. Not to mention new federative statutes: If they had appeared a year or two sooner, we would not today be having to encounter such dramatic processes in the republics. Lost time can be made up only by changing the mechanism of movement. Will the new presidential mechanism be able to do this?

Is society itself ready for such an attempt?

We must now speak with increasingly great reservations of society as something integral and unified. Even if we get away from national-state problems and from various regional situations full of conflict. Incompatible extremes exist and are growing against a background of general irritation, impatience, and at times despair. Yet we are seeing a huge mass of people awakening from political slumber, earnest enough to determine the new face of society. Although the awakening process is far from complete, is taking place unevenly in different corners of the country, and is suffering from the childhood diseases of populism, by and large it is moving in the direction set by the most democratic trends. The lessons of the rallies, demonstrations, and elections of both last year and, as far as can be judged, this year make it possible to consider that the notorious gulf between the intelligentsia and the mass of people, which has been the curse of our history for 150 years, is smaller today than ever before.

Many public opinion polls show that subjects and decisions that come as a painful shock to yesterday's official consciousness are perceived quite differently by a significant majority.

The frightening bugaboo of "human exploitation" still dominates the minds of a considerable section of our legislators and even of more practical government planners. The repeated elucidations of economists (N.P. Shmelev, for example, who remarked at the last Congress that, if this bugaboo is to be taken seriously, we will have to begin by closing down our state enterprises....) are still not accepted in this milieu. Meanwhile, the problem is different for the mass consciousness today: More than half see no obstacles even to the development of private enterprise in the country, while a considerable proportion are not averse to starting their own business.

Roughly the same contradiction also exists in respect of the ideological symbols of our history. The Kremlin hall and also a section of the "big" press perceive with indignation and horror attempts to criticize the first years of Soviet history. At the same time an all-union representative poll reveals just nine percent in favor of a ban on public discussion of the political course of those years.

Finally, the most painful problem of recent months—the future of the union and the republics' independence. Whatever umbrage people may take at the "authorities," and whatever historical and ideological arguments or grudges are set in motion here, there is no way to resolve the whole bunch of national-state problems other than the path to real cooperation in the interests of all peoples. The majority of the population understands this better than a considerable section of the corps of deputies. As long ago as last fall two-thirds of the population agreed that it was time to discuss questions of the republics' independence earnestly and openly....

In recent months requests have been sent down quite frequently from the bridge of our ship of state not to rock the boat, not to press, not to demand, not to trouble. People now speak in such a tone more rarely. Not, probably, because the boat is being rocked less but simply because we have to take this for granted and learn to sail on and hold on to the wheel in a fierce gale.

## Coal Representatives Respond to Congress Walkout

*PM1104090090 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 9 Apr 90 Morning Edition p 1*

[Unattributed report under the rubric "Response. IZVESTIYA No. 91": "Why They Walked Out of the Congress"]

[Text] We published under this headline the essence of the statement of representatives of the strike committees of the country's biggest coal enterprises, who walked out of last week's Coal Industry Workers Trade Union congress.

The statement said that the congress in question does not represent the interests of miners, two-thirds of its delegates are apparatchiks and employers, and the congress' decisions will scarcely be authoritative for the underground workers.

But another point of view exists, which was expounded by representatives of the new Central Council of the Coal Industry Workers Trade Union—as the coal workers' top trade union organ is now called—when they dropped into the IZVESTIYA offices.

This point of view was expounded by V. Lunev, Central Council chairman, who was secretary of the coal workers' trade union Central Committee before the congress; A. Kapustin, Central Council deputy chairman, who was chairman of the trade union's Sakhalin Territorial Committee before the congress; A. Makarskiy, chairman of the Dzerzhinskiy Mine Administration Trade Union Committee and deputy chairman of Rovno City Strike Committee, who was a breakage face worker until September of last year; A. Mikhalev, Central Council secretary, who was a breakage face miners' team leader at the "Donetskugol" Production Association "Trudovskaya" Mine before the congress; N. Polukhin, chairman of the trade union's Rovno Territorial Committee; and B. Titarenko, a breakage face miners' team leader at the "Rovenkiantratsit" Production Association's Cosmonauts Mine.

This is the essence of their viewpoint on what happened.

Yes, many problems have accumulated in the trade union movement, problems which eventually led to a decline in the prestige of the trade union's elected organs—from the grass roots up to the Central Committee. This led to an early report and election campaign and the extraordinary 15th congress of the sector trade union. But it would not be true to say that a congress of apparatchiks and employers was held; it was a congress of authorized representatives of labor collectives. Almost all the delegates were nominated in the collectives themselves, on a contested basis—without any "apparatus games," in conditions of democracy and glasnost.

Yes, there were many representatives of trade union committees among the delegates. But all these had passed the test of the report and election campaign beforehand and received a vote of confidence from their labor collectives.

In the reformed coal workers' trade union, the Central Council members were also elected in a different way. The coal workers' territorial conferences delegated Central Council members—and they delegated people they know well, who have passed the test, including the test posed by the period of the strike battle.

Moreover: Each territory is granted the right to recall its delegated Central Council member if, in the labor collectives' opinion, he is not fulfilling the duties incumbent on him or is pursuing an incorrect line.

The extraordinary 15th congress adopted the new statutes of the coal industry workers' trade union. This document was compiled on the basis of drafts formulated and discussed in the workers' collectives of coal enterprises in the Ukraine, the Kuzbass, and Karaganda. The new statutes proclaim and consolidate the trade union's total independence from all state, political, and social organizations; it is accountable to no one, under the control of no one, and is based only on the USSR Constitution, the Constitutions of the union republics, and international documents on the protection of human rights.

The statutes adopted may be incomplete, but today they are the best, most vigorous, and most democratic statutes in the country's trade union movement. The congress adopted the statutes, but the document will be further discussed in the miners' collectives, and if need be, necessary additions or amendments will be made.

Finally, a last point. Opinions are being voiced that during the strikes the miners demanded specifically that a miners' congress be held, whereas it was a sector congress that took place, and so the need to convene a miners' forum and form a trade union of miners, and miners alone, persists.

A forum of this kind will be held. Nor are there any objections to forming a separate union or association of miners—in the final analysis, this is a question that miners themselves must resolve. But should we fragment our strength? The trade union delegations from Great Britain, France, the FRG, Poland, Australia, and South Africa who were present at the congress and saw and heard everything warned against the dangers of schism.

Today as never before, unity is needed, in order to avoid disrupting the country with spontaneous strikes and to conduct an open and honest, constructive dialogue with the government. It is possible to seek the full implementation of government resolution No. 608 and to protect the rights of working people. To this end, work on the trade union's reform must be continued, so that it becomes the true voice of the labor collectives' will.

All the prerequisites for this already exist. And by July or August, by the time a miners' congress is convened, it will be clear whether coal workers have the union they need.

## Draft Amendments to Cooperative Law Submitted

*PM1004134790 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 8 Apr 90 Second Edition p 2*

[Unattributed report: "Government Submits Proposals"]

[Text] In accordance with the work schedule of the USSR Supreme Soviet, the USSR Council of Ministers submitted 6 April 1990 the draft law on the introduction of amendments and additions to the USSR Law "On the Cooperative System in the USSR" for consideration by the Supreme Soviet.

The draft incorporates measures to create equitable organizational, legal, and economic conditions for the work of cooperatives and state enterprises. During its elaboration proposals submitted by citizens and by state, cooperative, and social organizations to improve the legislative regulation of cooperatives' activities were taken into account.

The government proposes that the procedure for organizing cooperatives be more clearly defined. It is envisaged that cooperatives will be established with due consideration for the population's needs and for priorities in the development of specific types of production, on the basis of conclusions reached by commissions of deputies specially set up for this purpose at local soviets of people's deputies. A uniform stipulation is being introduced concerning the obligatory state registration of cooperatives and the acquisition by them of licenses authorizing them to engage in the type of activities specified in their statutes. In addition, it is proposed to introduce the registration of unions and other cooperative associations. This will strengthen their legal position.

Changes are also being introduced in the procedure to end the activities of cooperatives. This can happen, for instance, as a result of crude violations of financial discipline, or the rules governing foreign trade operations, and also the infringement of the cooperative's statutes. At the same time the guarantees of the observance of cooperative members' rights are being enhanced: Local soviet executive committee decisions can be appealed within a three-month period; and the cooperative is entitled to continue its activities until a court reaches a verdict.

It is planned to establish order in cooperatives' financial activities, to introduce more precise stipulations as regards the settlement of accounts, and to remove unjustified discrepancies in the rights of cooperatives and state enterprises as regards the use of cash, which is bound to have a salutary effect on money circulation.

Practical experience gathered in recent years has shown that many shortcomings in the work of cooperatives are connected with inadequate supervision on the part of the state organs. It is proposed to intensify financial and banking supervision and enhance cooperative members' responsibility for supplying correct information on incomes and expenditure. At the same time the interference of state and cooperative organs in the day-to-day economic activities of cooperatives is ruled out.

Provision is also made for the necessary clarifications to be introduced in the Law "On the Cooperative System in the USSR" provision which regulates labor relations within cooperatives.

These and many other amendments and additions are aimed at improving the legal basis of the activities of cooperatives and the enhancement of their role and prestige in society.

## Survey of Informal Groups Published

*18120113B Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 7, 25 Feb-4 Mar 90 p 9*

[Article by historian Gleb Pavlovskiy and journalist Maxim Meyer: "Public Movements in the USSR: Who? Where? How Many?"]

[Text] The main trend last year was their geographical spread over the USSR. Popular fronts and movements became more active in Uzbekistan and Moldavia, in the Abkhazian, South Ossetian, Daghestan, Chechen-Ingush and Buryat Autonomous Republics. There are now centres of public activity in the Donbas, Vorkuta, Volgograd, and Petrozavodsk. The old Russian city of Yaroslavl can now be regarded as the capital of independent mvoements of the Russian Federation. The Popular Front of Russia was formed there.

The unofficial groups and associations can be roughly divided into three types in accordance with their structure: 1) popular fronts; 2) clubs, associations, societies, amalgamations; 3) parties and political associations of a party type. Besides, members of the most important movements designate them variously as patriotic, workers, socialist, social-democratic, liberal-democratic, ecological, monarchist, anarcho-syndicalist, religious.

Finally, all the movements can be divided into the national-democratic, which have been formed in the Union Republics and Autonomous Regions, and general-democratic, which have been formed in big administrative areas of the Russian Federation, Moscow, Leningrad, partly in Byelorussia, the Ukraine and Kazakhstan. National democratic and general-democratic movements differ not only in the size of their membership but also in their strategic goals, their techniques and socio-psychological principles. For this reason, popular fronts, associations and parties in the Russian Federation and the other Republics substantially differ, while they have the same names and structures.

### Popular Fronts

Popular fronts are broad amalgamations of various kinds of political groups and unions which adhere to a general democratic platform.

Popular fronts are formed in two ways. They are formed out of already existing unofficial groups (such are the popular fronts of Moscow, the Urals, Leningrad). Sometimes an amorphous general-democratic platform of

various political forces serves as a necessary medium for the formation of a stable structure (the popular fronts of Yaroslavl, Chelyabinsk, the Stavropol Territory). Most national popular fronts have been founded in this way. On the whole, a popular front is a kind of parliament, a spontaneously formed civil forum.

At the moment this country has nearly 140 popular fronts and similar organizations. Popular fronts of a general-democratic nature include those of Moscow, Leningrad, Russia, Yaroslavl, the Tatar Autonomous Republic, Tomsk, Stavropol Territory, Chelyabinsk, the Urals, Orel, Krasnoyarsk, Kuban, Cherepovets, Kalinin (Tver), the Popular Front of the RSFSR. Similar in their structure and mode of operation are the United Democratic Movement of Murmansk, the Far Eastern Association of Democratic Movements, the Association of Democratic Movements of Kaliningrad and the Kaliningrad Region, the Yakut Democratic Union for Perestroika. A number of popular fronts (in the Northern Caucasus, Nizhny Novgorod, Togliatti) are still being formed, while others, like the Baikal Popular Front and the Kuibyshev Popular Front, are either disbanding or have already done so.

There are continued attempts to bring the various amalgamations together. An example is the Inter-Regional Association of Democratic Organizations formed in Chelyabinsk in October 1989 which incorporates several hundred members of more than 90 associations, clubs and groups of the USSR. It is still not clear whether such broad associations can be viable.

National-democratic popular fronts that first emerged as separate units now often become unions of various parties, associations, groups and movements. Lithuania's Sajudis, the Popular Front of Latvia, the Popular Front of Estonia, the Ukrainian Rukh, the Popular Fronts of Moldavia, Byelorussia and Uzbekistan (Birlik) were all formed in this way. These popular fronts push the idea of a national or regional parliament. National-democratic fronts exist practically in all the Union Republics, Autonomous Republics and Autonomous Regions from the Buryat Autonomous Republic of Moldavia. The most recent, formed in the summer and autumn of 1989, were the Ukrainian Rukh and the Association of Independent Public Organizations of Kazakhstan.

The popular front movement in the Baltics and Moldavia is special in that they also have Interfronts, organizations which pose an alternative to the national-democratic movement and whose members are usually Russian-speaking residents of these Republics. More or less strong positions are held by the intermovement in Estonia, and by interfront in Latvia and Moldavia. Interfronts' membership is at least 30,000. The formation of interfronts does not always occur—they have not been created in the Ukraine, Armenia, Byelorussia, Kazakhstan, or the Buryat Autonomous Republic. Interfronts are usually formed where there are Russian-speaking communities who have not been integrated into the culture of the indigenous population, when national-democratic movements have erred in their national policy to the disadvantage of the Russian-speaking population.

There is a rather big group of clubs and associations calling itself "Russian-patriotic." In their number are numerous associations of Pamyat—the Pamyat Russian National-Patriotic Front, the People's Patriotic Front of Pamyat (D. Vasilyev), the Pamyat World Anti-Semitic and Anti-Masonic Front (Ye. Yemelyanov), the Russian Patriotic Union in Moscow and the Russian National-Patriotic Centre in Leningrad, the Novosibirsk Pamyat Historic-Patriotic Association, the Tyumen and Sverdlovsk Otechestvo Association, the Vernost Patriotic Association in Irkutsk, the Ratobor Patriotic Association in Alapayevsk, etc. As well as the regional and urban patriotic organizations all-Russia associations have recently appeared: the association United Council of Russia (Popular Harmony), the association of enthusiasts of Russian literature and art Yedinstvo, the Union of the Homeland's Spiritual Revival. The declared common goal of these patriotic groups and unions is to revive Russia within the borders of the Russian Empire, to unite all its nations in one strong state, to oppose separatism, to restore the Orthodox Christian faith as the Russian nation's spiritual foundation, to create "interrelated" state and cultural institutions, to oppose the policy of "capitalization" and westernization of Russian life and to promote traditional forms of economy and urban life.

**Civil Organizations**

The other large group of public associations consist of democratic clubs, groups and associations covering a broad spectrum of public interests. They constitute around two-thirds of the country's unofficial politicized groups. Among traditional democratic clubs there are the clubs Democratic Perestroika in Moscow and the Moscow Region, Leningrad, Volgodonsk and Makhachkala and the clubs of Civil and Socio-Political Initiatives in Murmansk and Kostomuksha. An example of amateur societies is the Staraya Ladoga in Leningrad. Associations formed in Severodvinsk, Naberezhniye Chelny, Norilsk and other cities are political clubs in the traditional sense.

The club movement is based on the idea of common support for radical reforms in politics and in the economic and social spheres, for public self-government, and the restored role of the individual in political thinking.

The 1989-1990 elections touched off a wave of new voters' clubs, voters' councils, and public organizations' councils for the conduct of elections. The biggest among them are the Moscow Association of Voters that encompasses 30 district clubs, the Donetsk Voters' Union, the Volgograd Voters' Bloc, the Kharkov, Sumy, and Krasnoyarsk Vybory-90 (Elections-90) societies. Their ideology varies from one club to another and is not stable

because these clubs form spontaneously, have a huge membership and are geared for practical action. But their general democratic trend is obvious. Autumn of 1989 saw the foundation of the All-Union Association of Voters.

The first workers' clubs and groups appeared back in 1987, but the trend peaked at the height of the strike movement (spring-summer 1989). There are at the moment several dozen clubs and specifically workers' organizations—strike committees which communicate with one another via the Organizing Committee to prepare a congress of independent workers' movements and organizations. It's hard to estimate the number of people involved in the workers' movement, but it is thought to be anywhere between 50,000 and 100,000.

Party clubs formed in the spirit of democratization of the CPSU are specific since all their members are in the CPSU. Such clubs exist in practically all major cities around the country and what they mainly do is to demand a faster democratization of the CPSU, the elimination of Article 6 from the USSR Constitution, and the inclusion of the provision on factions in Party Rules. The most powerful among party clubs is the Moscow Party Club bringing together a considerable number of Party organizations in the city. On January 20-21 delegates of the country's Party clubs held their first national conference to formulate an alternative platform for the coming 28th CPSU Congress.

**Those Calling Themselves Parties**

Parties and "protoparties" are actively growing structures which set the tone for the nonformal public movement. Most of the parties were formed in Moscow and Leningrad before their influence spread to the RSFSR, the Ukraine and Byelorussia. First formed in these two cities were the Democratic Union, two Democratic Parties, the Constitutional-Democratic Union Civil Dignity, the Party of Urban and Rural Masters, the All-Union Communist Party of Working People. The following structures can be defined as "protoparties": the Christian-Democratic and the Christian Patriotic Unions, the Conference of Anarcho-Syndicalists, and the Social-Democratic Association. There is also the USSR's first local branch of the Italian Radical Party, Radical Association for Peace and Freedom. A Socialist Party is now in its formative stage.

The growing Green Party plans to bring together more than 300 clubs, groups and associations around the country. At the moment such amalgamations of Green groups as the Socio-Ecological Union, the Green Movement and the Students' Ecological Council play the role of coordination councils without any clearly defined political ideology. The Union Republics, especially in the Baltics, have a whole crop of parties: Social-Democratic, Christian-Democratic, Democratic, Workers' Unions, Unions of National Independence, etc.

The most important entity there is the "Big Three"—the Social-Democrats, the Socialists and the Democratic Union. The future may bring a coalition between the Social-Democrats, the Constitutional Democrats, the Democratic Party and the All-Union Communist Party of Working People.

The Social-Democrats, after their successful founding congress in Tallinn, January 12-14, include nearly 100 local organizations totalling around 4,000 members. In addition to Moscow and Leningrad the other major centres for Social-Democrats are Chelyabinsk (the Urals Social-Democratic Centre), Kiev (the Perestroika Club, the Social-Democratic Association, etc.), Tashkent (the Democratic Movement of Uzbekistan), Perm (the Social-Democratic Workers' Movement), Vladivostok (Clubs' Association "Democrat"). The ideology of the Social-Democrats and that of the modernization of society on the basis of pluralism of ownership, political life and the parliamentary system proved to be attractive not only for socialist clubs and groups but also for the national-democratic movements. The Social-Democratic Association was joined by the Estonian Social-Democratic Party of Labour, the Georgian Social-Democratic Party.

The "New Socialists" who regard themselves as a party of working people demand a limited market system and prefer the idea of self-government over parliament. The first congress of the Socialist Party is planned for spring 1990 in the city of Prokopyevsk, the centre of last summer's coal miners' strikes.

The Democratic Union formed in May 1988 has nearly 2,000 members. Owing to its horizontal structure, it has more than one centre. There are a number of independent branches in Moscow, the North-East, and Siberia. The Party's strongest centres are in Moscow, Leningrad and Novosibirsk, while Democratic Union groups of 5-10 exist in practically all big cities in the USSR, including the capitals of the Union Republics. The Democratic Union's ideology is uniform on the whole, but can vary, because its regional branches are independent. Generally speaking, their programme calls for the establishment of democracy, with a multiparty system and a fundamental confrontation with the governing body. The 3rd Democratic Union Congress in January 1990 called for the adoption of a new programme at the 4th congress of the party in March-April 1990.

The number of participants in the ecology movement by far exceeds the membership of the biggest independent parties numbering tens of thousands. It was ecologists who stopped the construction of nuclear power stations in the Tatar Autonomous Republic, near Gorky and in Byelorussia. Thanks to them, a nuclear power station in Armenia was closed and a number of polluting factories were shut down or converted. Ecological groups are active in practically all areas of the country, although their actions are often uncoordinated.

Attempts to form religious and political parties in the RSFSR continue. Christian-Democratic unions and associations are already in existence. The religious movement has been strongly politicized in the Ukraine by advocates of the Uniate and by supporters of the independent church in Lithuania. Orthodox Christians have yet to find adequate political representatives. Groups of "Russian patriots" with monarchist tendencies usually lay claim to that role.

Editor's Note: All contributions to this page have been prepared by the staff and consultants at the Centre for Political and Legal Studies and Information, set up under the auspices of "MOSCOW NEWS."

## Past Psychiatric Abuses Examined

*90US0773A Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY in Russian No 14, 7-13 Apr 90 p 7*

[Article by Professor O. Vilenskiy, doctor of medical sciences: "Psychiatry and Politics"]

[Text] **Were abuses in the organization of psychiatric help isolated, or was there a system of abuses that was brought about by the state of our society? Today this is one of the most crucial questions in our country's psychiatry. Professor O. Vilenskiy, a doctor of medical sciences, sets forth his point of view.**

For the last two years, quite a few critical articles devoted to psychiatry have appeared in the central press, including in ARGUMENTY I FAKTY. A widespread public response compels a new look at the functions of this science and its place in society.

First, the number of persons suffering from mental disorders was always rather significant and had a permanent tendency toward growth. Now their number varies from 3 to 30 percent of the population in different countries and regions.

Second, and this is extremely important, society's attitude toward them always bore a conflicting character. On the one hand, they were viewed as holy and close to god, and, on the other hand, they were thought of as pitiful and dangerous madmen. In the last 200 years, despite the significant progress in medicine, these tendencies were preserved, although to a lesser degree. As previously, not only mental illness but the fact of going to a psychiatrist causes those around to be cautious. Many people eagerly tell their friends details of physical ailments, but they studiously conceal the slightest mental indisposition.

Not only in our country. In the United States, for example, people often turn to a psychiatrist for help, which is almost the fashionable thing to do. Nevertheless, when reports were leaked to the press about the fact that vice-presidential candidate Thomas Eagleton underwent a course of treatment with a psychiatrist for depression, he was immediately removed from participation in the elections.

Third, not one sphere of medicine is associated with social questions as much as psychiatry. In many cases, the conclusion of a psychiatrist plays a decisive role in the fate of a patient.

Finally, in all epochs state authority turned to psychiatrists with a request to resolve one or another conflicting situation (recall the fate of P. Chadayev during the reign of Nikolay I), that is, regardless of good or evil intentions there have always been attempts to politicize psychiatry. All of this creates the climate for a guarded attitude toward psychiatry, and requires special responsibility from doctors.

### The Alternative—Prison or Mental Hospital

The abuses of psychiatrists with respect to dissidents inflicted great damage on the prestige of psychiatry. I personally did not encounter such cases, but I have no reasons for denying them. However, I think that this question is frequently treated in a one-sided way in the press. It turns out that a mentally healthy person was intentionally subjected to psychiatric diagnosis and was thereby condemned to a long stay in a mental hospital for political convictions. But at first criminal proceedings were brought against him, and only after this was he assigned to court-psychiatric expert analysis. In this case, there was an alternative—prison, or a mental hospital. Moreover, the decision on forced treatment was not made by doctors but by the court. Apparently, these people were not subject to judicial prosecution, but this does not fall within the jurisdiction of psychiatry.

Some articles cite examples "of mentally healthy people" who unjustifiably find themselves in a mental hospital, but their statements and peculiarities of behavior are very reminiscent of excerpts from histories of ailments. The conclusion about their mental health is formed by the journalist on the basis of the words of the patient himself, or comes out of such judgments, for example, as: "but she teaches mathematics." As if teaching mathematics excludes the presence of mental illness.

It must not be forgotten that a majority of patients look at their mental condition absolutely uncritically and very often declare that they are absolutely healthy, that they were placed in the hospital by mistake, etc. (Today, 2-3,000 patients continue to contest their placement on a mental register—Editor.) Some of the readers propose establishing strict control over the work of doctor psychiatrists. It is known that mistakes are possible in any branch of medicine. For example, unsuccessful surgical operations are not uncommon. But no one accuses surgeons of the conscious abuse of a scalpel. Why must psychiatrists be regarded as potential criminals?

The contact between a mental patient and a doctor must occur in an extremely wholehearted and intimate situation, but the specific nature of mental disorders is such that reading about one's medical history could sharply worsen the condition of the patient. In general, the

aggressiveness of the unique antipsychiatry campaign in the press can only aggravate people's distrust and fear of doctors.

At the present time, when the legal rights of mental patients have been broadened significantly, there should be a clearer definition of their obligations to society. In particular, they cannot be allowed in professions associated with people's safety. It should also be kept in mind that groundless mass removal of such patients from the register will inevitably lead to an increase in publicly dangerous actions.

**Scientists Are Debating, Patients Are Suffering**

A serious charge directed at psychiatry is its lack of a strict scientific foundation in the form of achievements of modern science, differences between specialists regarding the formulation of a diagnosis of "schizophrenia," and various points of view on the border between normality and pathology. However, in making this charge it is forgotten, first, that similar kinds of disagreement exists in other branches of medicine. Second, there exist in psychiatry classical and carefully described symptoms of mental disorders, which are the basis for diagnostics. It is not different schools that determine the inconsistency in diagnostics but most of all the different qualifications of psychiatrists. Therefore, the main guarantee against abuses of psychiatry are a high level of professional mastery and honesty of specialists.

Various publications unanimously accuse Academician A. Snezhnevskiy of apparently "discovering" a new form of schizophrenia—languor, which he "discovered" especially for dissidents. In reality, it was described (under the designation "soft") by Soviet psychiatrists L. Rozenstein and A. Kronfeld in 1932. (In foreign classifications it is found under the name "latent" and "ambulatory.")

But it is not a matter of classification, rather that schizophrenia exists in real life. In a significant percentage of patients it occurs slowly, with an effaced but rather typical symptomatology. These patients can work productively for many years and maintain themselves within the scope of social relations, but they need medical help because, sooner or later, steady personality changes take place in them that lead to social disintegration.

Unquestionably, psychiatry needs serious perestroyka; however, it must be conducted not in the form of confrontation and indiscriminate criticism but in the form of specific and constructive assistance in the resolution of pressing problems.

**From the editor. The abuse of psychiatry for political purposes—although a bitter and indisputable fact, is confirmed by more than dozens of criminal cases. Naturally, this could not help but leave a negative imprint in the public conscience on the attitude of people toward doctor-psychiatrists. It is even possible today to talk about the crisis of trust toward psychiatry on the part of the public. Therefore, the main question is not the protection of the "honor of the uniform," but the creation of an efficient legislative mechanism that absolutely precludes the politicization of psychiatry.**

## Buryat Official Views Party February Plenum

*90UN1376A Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 28 Mar 90 p 2*

[Article by V. Buldayev, first secretary of the Zaigrayevskiy Rayon Committee of the CPSU, Buryat Autonomous Soviet Soviet Socialist Republic: "At the Congress—With a Store of Ideas"]

[Text] I was reading material from the February Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, and for some reason I imagined the following scene. Delegates to the party congress, heading for the hall, were going up the main stairway, and the restrained hum of voices mingled with the clearly audible tinkling of decorations and medals. A typical detail, is that not so? I heard about this from one of the delegates about 10 years ago, and for some reason I cannot forget it to this day. Of course, people at that time received decorations for various reasons—both deserved and not very much so. But this is not the point. Think about it: The representativeness of the congress was determined not so much by the store of thoughts and ideas, as by the density and sound of the clanging of medals. Past services, age, sex, and position were more important factors than ideological position. And as a result there was total unanimity accompanied by stormy applause.

That is the way it was. There is no way to escape one's own history, even its worst pages. But this will not happen anymore—the plenum expressed itself very definitely on this account. Fortunately, the stagnation-era practice whereby nominations for congresses and elections of the leading organs were programmed ahead of time by the apparatus, and only democratic embellishments were furnished, is becoming a thing of the past. But relapses occur, not infrequently even under perestroyka. It is enough to mention the procedure, as if performed according to script, for the election of hundreds of USSR people's deputies from the CPSU, or to will recall the story of the recent creation of a Bureau of the Central Committee for the RSFSR. I am not referring to the supporters of an independent Russian Communist Party, but an unpleasant aftertaste remains from the fact that a very important decision was made without the advice of the communists of Russia. If we add to these similar cases on an oblast and rayon scale, then the reasons for the mass dissatisfaction on the part of communists and their demands for the democratization of internal party life on the whole, and election procedures in particular, become understandable.

The plenum recognized such demands as right, and it agreed with the need to convene the 28th congress more quickly. It is a pity, of course, that the initiative was missed once again, and that decisions look like a forced concession to some kind of other social forces. We "from the rayons" were perplexed by the proposals to conduct

reports and elections campaigns hastily. Taking the forthcoming structural perestroyka into account, this, in reality, is a futile effort.

Another matter is even more important. The new procedure for the election of delegates to the congress, the changes in organization, and the forms of reports and elections would not have prompted any objections in themselves, if there was unity in the party on questions of the program and tactics. However, we are living, to use Lenin's words, in an epoch of disorder and clannishness. **And, in not achieving ideological harmony, and in not fixing the boundaries according to fundamental positions, it is not worth addressing—this is also a Leninist thought—the forms in which internal party life should be implemented.**

Take for example the idea of contested direct elections on the territory of party okrugs. Does this sound inviting? Unquestionably. An open and honest campaign is conducted, and the brilliant outstanding personality wins. But this is theory, while in fact there will be a competition not of personalities, not of like-thinking party members, but a program of various interpretations—from left radicals to social democrats and nationalists. In other words, not a group, and not even a factional campaign, but a real interparty campaign that is covered by talk of the unity of the CPSU. One can talk, of course, about the fact that the communists will investigate and make the right choice, and that they will rebuff the shouters and the demagogues. However, the results of the USSR people's deputy elections, and also the current election campaign, indicate that not everything is that simple. The situation that has developed in a number of regions clearly attests to the fact that the problem is not one of election procedure, but of ideological and political choice.

And one more fact must not be passed over. Whereas previously in the selection of candidates the apparatus almost went so far as to take eye color into account, now the other extreme is observed. A typical example is the recent nomination of people's deputy candidates in the republic and the local soviets. Difficulties arose here in Buryatiya with regard to representation of the indigenous (!) nationality in the soviets of various levels. There are clearly few workers and peasants among the deputies. Should this also be listed among the achievements of democracy?

Just imagine a conference or a congress where talkative government service types prevail in the hall. I do not know about others, but this does not make me more optimistic. Attempts to find an opportunity for representation of the working class and the peasantry in the structure of the delegates to the upcoming congress, I fear, will run up against open demagogy; the apparatus, they'll say, wants to promote the workers and the peasants in order to control them more easily. So the proposal heard at the plenum of the CPSU Central Committee concerning quotas is not the kind of reinsurance that it seems to some.

And it is not a way out, if we are honest. **The question about whom to elect as representatives and authorities and how to go about doing so will be critical on the agenda until such time as we figure out who is in the party, and whose interests it expresses.** This is all the more important, because the changes in the basic property relations cannot help but influence the additional building processes. The attempt to please everyone simply disorganizes internal party life. Whether we do or do not like what is occurring in the Baltics, it is impossible not to see that it is the common character underlying many of the proposed objectives and interests and the clarity of tactical aims that activated people, and that put an end to the monopolistic authority of the apparatus and brought forth new leaders. In the process, yesterday's "liabilities" were frequently transformed into "assets" without any kind of procedural innovations.

I emphasize that I am entirely in favor of the search for and the development of a new mechanism for implementing internal party democracy. But I do not share the view of it as some kind of magic wand. Perhaps earlier only mediocrities who were useful to the authorities were elected delegates and members of electoral party organs? Of course not, especially in recent times, when a negative attitude has developed in party circles toward any kind of "preliminary lists." As an example of those deservedly elected, I can name V. Khlebnikov and S. Naychukova, members of the oblast party committee from our rayon party organization, whose liveliness and adherence to principles are well worth envying. A majority of the rayon party committee also cannot be categorized as window dressing. It turns out that our trouble does not lie in the fact that we are not electing the "right ones," but in the fact that it is difficult for them to work productively, when instead of a clear, well-thought-out program we have only a collection of contradictory opinions that do not clarify today's situation and that do not provide reference points for the future. At times, two members of the Central Committee can even interpret the word "perestroyka" itself in opposite ways.

This is not nostalgia for a "hard line," although I believe that **any party must clearly define a line for itself that makes a distinction between flexibility and readiness to compromise and a lack of principles. Only in such a case will its basic organizations feel that they are on solid ground.** Especially if the development of a single policy and tactic stops being the privilege of the central authorities alone.

It is precisely in this arena that the experience of the accountability of people's deputies to the voters can be fully utilized. Whether the form of elections is direct or "graduated," each delegate or member of the party committee is obligated not simply to represent the interests of a specific primary rayon and oblast party organization, but also, without fail, to defend them with a subsequent report before his comrades. When there is a coincidence of positions on the part of several party organizations, their representatives, as the saying goes, can form a unified front.

True, it is hardly possible to delineate clearly the various aspects of the problem of party democratization. Everything here is firmly interwoven.

I can understand the fierce criticism that is directed at the apparatchiks. Unfortunately, gross miscalculations are permitted at various levels of party authority even today. For example, communists ask me why the new chief of the Organizational and Cadre Work Department of the CPSU oblast committee was appointed without discussion and without consulting the people? The appointment system in our hierarchy is not among the best! But I, a member of the oblast committee, am compelled just to throw up my hands in dismay. Nevertheless, another thing is apparent: Without preparation, practice, and experience, a lot of stupid things could be done, especially in today's complex situation.

Direct, secret, and contested elections of the first secretary? I agree without reservation, and I also agree with the need for limiting the term for holding a post. But, still, I would not put the stress on procedure—why make a fetish out of it? The main thing is that **professionalism is an indispensable condition for a party worker: We have already endured enough from the amateurs.**

It is possible that my judgments will seem debatable. But it is hardly likely that anyone now possesses the final truth. Strictly speaking, important party-wide talks are necessary for this before the congress.

## Economic

### Bunich Says Reform To Affect State Bureaucracy

*PM1304155190 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 13 Apr 90 Second Edition p 2*

[Unattributed report: "On the Market's Threshold"]

[Text] The transition of 70 percent of state enterprises to the leasing system will help to do away with the majority of major management structures in the USSR—the Gosplan [State Planning Committee], the Gossnab [State Committee for Material and Technical Supply], and the sector ministries. This was announced by P. Bunich, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Economic Reform Questions and corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences, who spoke at a press conference for Soviet and foreign journalists yesterday. Speaking about the specific sphere of the economy—defense production, space programs, fundamental scientific research—P. Bunich advocated that industrial enterprises performing these tasks should remain within the structure of the relevant ministries and departments.

Those attending the press conference were briefed on the intention of the government and of a sizeable proportion of the USSR deputies corps to considerably accelerate the process of the economy's destatization. It is intended that all resources constituting development funds should be left at enterprises' disposal as of next 1 July. By using these resources, labor collectives will be able to buy out plants and run production in the form of joint stock ownership. Economists are duly taking into account the danger of rising prices and the inflation processes associated with it.

Measures are therefore planned to index-link the population's incomes—this would apply primarily to sundry wage supplements and pensions. Funds for this purpose should come from the taxation of entrepreneurial activity in the country.

### Abalkin Sees Need To Advance Reforms

*904A0296A Moscow PRAVITELSTVENNYY VESTNIK in Russian No 13, Mar 90 pp 6-7*

[Interview with Academician L.I. Abalkin, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers State Commission for Economic Reform, by Yu. Rytov: "Criticism of the Reform and the 'Critical Mass' of its Successes"]

[Text] [Rytov] Leonid Ivanovich, it follows as clearly as could be from the first program speech of the first USSR president at the Congress of People's Deputies that the fate of perestroyka and the fate of the country will largely depend on the pace and quality of the economic reform. "I believe," M.S. Gorbachev said, "that we need decisive action to radicalize the economic reform. We need first of all to disclose in practice the immense creative potential contained in the laws on property, land, and leasing, and in other legislative instruments of this package, whose enactment is in the final phase.... The laws will not work of their own accord, and people's initiative and enterprise will founder unless we create the appropriate economic environment. We must really involve ourselves in the creation of a full-blooded domestic market. This is a most complex economic, political, and psychological problem. It cannot be resolved with just one pass, but even today we need to act consistently here, ridding ourselves of all fears and complexes."

This is directly related to the first question. To what extent are the new political aims influencing the content of the government economic recovery program, the progress and consistency of the economic reform, and the style and methods of work of the commission you head?

[Abalkin] I believe it is clear to everyone today that the way toward the renewal of the socialist society lies through the implementation of radical reforms. And it is now more obvious than ever before that extricating the economy from the profound crisis, achieving a serious increase in production efficiency, and resolving the accumulated social problems are impossible without a fundamental renewal of the entire system of economic relations and the entire economic mechanism. We are convinced that it is economic reform that could lead to the creation of a modern economy combining the extensive use of market mechanisms and systems of planned regulation and social protection of the population.

There is frequently simplistic talk about the market economy. This concept is convenient from the viewpoint of denoting the actual mechanism of the functioning of an economic system. Although, of course, like any standard appellation, it glosses over the complex internal structure of this system. It should be emphasized over and over that world practice does not contain examples of an efficiently functioning economy receptive to S&T innovations and oriented toward consumer demand without developed market relations.

It may be considered proven that such an economy cannot exist in principle. Incidentally, the lessons of our past are yet further confirmation of this conclusion. The main issue today is how and in what way to effect the transition from the evolved administrative-command system to a fundamentally new system of economic relations, how to minimize the social costs which are inevitable at the time of such a transition, and within what timeframe and in what order of sequence to implement the set of measures necessary for this. The slowness and half-baked approach of the adopted decisions—and to an even greater extent of the practical steps—that were permitted in the past have sharply limited the possibilities for maneuvering and the postponement of the solution of the accumulated questions.

[Rytov] From this also, most likely, there arose—as social necessity and political task—the need for a sharp acceleration of economic reform?

[Abalkin] Yes, and this conclusion, which was drawn in the program speech by M.S. Gorbachev, the first Soviet president, requires of the government appreciable adjustments to the program for economic recovery and transition to the market. It is not, I believe, a question of a fundamental change in the very concept of the transition, which is clearly outlined in the government program and which was approved by the Second Congress of People's Deputies. It is a matter of shortening the timeframe of the accomplishment of this program and of the need to bring forward the implementation of priority measures.

There arises primarily the need for the extraordinary implementation of a set of interrelated measures that would sharply accelerate this process.

Understandably, transition to the market cannot be effected in the form of a one-time act. This is for any competent specialist perfectly natural and requires no special proof. But no less material either is the fact that market components cannot be introduced in disconnected fashion.

[Rytov] Leonid Ivanovich, you once spoke about "critical mass"—a particular sum total of conditions necessary for making the market a reality. What is meant here?

[Abalkin] What conditions are needed for the market to become a reality? These include radical changes in the pricing mechanism, the introduction of a uniform profit-taxation system, a change in credit policy, and the implementation of anti-inflation measures and also of measures pertaining to the social protection of the needy population strata. I believe that this entire sum of measures should be implemented extraordinarily and no later than the start of 1991.

[Rytov] What then?

[Abalkin] Completion of the market mechanism will be implemented subsequently. This will take a considerable length of time and could, possibly, take up the whole of the coming five-year plan. It will be necessary to create a ramified system of commodity markets and commercial-information centers and to create and fine-tune the operation of a stock market. It will be necessary to undertake on quite an extensive scale the denationalization of property, including the creation of a system of leased enterprises, joint-stock partnerships, cooperatives, mixed enterprises, and individual labor, including peasant, farms. It is these structures, based on diverse forms of ownership and competition with one another, that will permit the creation of conditions for the real functioning of a market. It will hardly be possible without them.

[Rytov] You have cited conditions that are essential, but hardly sufficient....

[Abalkin] Yes, the training of personnel who are professionally knowledgeable about methods of managing the market, who are conversant with credit matters, and who know how to operate under the new conditions represents a considerable difficulty. It will also take time to cultivate a whole generation of people capable of thinking in the new way and of working under the new conditions, to change the evolved stereotypes of economic behavior, and to overcome the habit not so much of earning resources as demanding them by way of pressure on government authorities. The consistent stage-by-stage transition to the convertibility of the Soviet ruble will be effected at this time also, which will make it possible to incorporate the Soviet economy more actively in world economic relations. All these measures will, I believe, breathe life into the laws that have already been enacted and open the way to new ones.

[Rytov] In my view, you have now touched on a question of supreme importance. Can it seriously be expected that some centralized instrument has been enacted, and our entire life will change immediately? Should an evaluation of the current situation not be approached more realistically?

[Abalkin] Yes, the appropriate environment, a kind of nutrient soil, is required for the laws on property, leasing, and land to start "working." Otherwise, the fundamentally important provisions contained in these laws will remain merely declarations lacking real force and influence on the economic situation in the country. None of these measures may be implemented spontaneously. Experience shows that the solution of the major

problems regarding structural change in the national economy require program support. A program with a precise specific goal, determination of the directions and paths for accomplishing a particular task coordinated among these various directions and, finally, the mechanism for achieving the set goals itself is essential.

[Rytov] It is such work, probably, that is within the sphere of activity of the USSR Council of Ministers State Commission for Economic Reform?

[Abalkin] Yes, at the present time the USSR Council of Ministers State Commission for Economic Reform is completing the elaboration of a number of such large-scale programs. I would like to cite among them primarily the programs of transition to the market, the implementation of antitrust measures, the creation of a network of small businesses, and the formation of managerial personnel for the economic reform. Elaboration is under way in the commission simultaneously of a number of new legislative instruments, including draft laws on the USSR State Bank and the banking system, and on joint-stock companies.

[Rytov] Now, Leonid Ivanovich, I have a particularly fundamental question. Are you convinced that the establishment of strong presidential authority will contribute to the acceleration of economic reform?

[Abalkin] I would answer this question as follows. Acceleration of economic reform is possible only given a number of conditions. And I would like to speak primarily here about the need for the presence of strong and authoritative political power. Large-scale changes of a fundamental nature require for their realization political will and quite wide-ranging powers. The USSR president is now endowed with such powers. Naturally, the introduction of such an office is an essential condition for advancing the economic reform and overcoming the inertia of the old system. But no less important is the authority of the political leadership as a whole and the authority of executive power. Permit me to share observations that I have built up over many years. Both our own experience and world practice show that radical reforms may be implemented only by authorities that enjoy the broad and unreserved support of the people. Otherwise such reforms cannot be implemented, and the government attempting to implement them will inevitably be discarded by a wave of protest.

The first condition—strong political authority—already exists. Consequently, the center of gravity is shifting to the second sphere. Public consent and a kind of civic peace are needed now more than ever. Only on this condition can general support for presidential decrees, confidence in his program, and the people's readiness to consent to certain sacrifices be secured.

[Rytov] What kind of sacrifices are you speaking about?

[Abalkin] Transition from one system of management to another is always painful. And a certain price has always to be paid for this transition. Harboring illusions and hoping for a painless transition are absolutely impermissible. People must know the truth. And whoever proposes reforms should tell the people the whole truth and not attempt to dodge sharp corners.

It needs to be remembered here that the longer we put off radical change, the higher the price society will have to pay. We have already missed the time when this transition could have been effected with relatively low costs. We can argue about why this was not done earlier as much as we like, but it is no longer possible to change anything and replay history. We have to come to terms with the reality of the present situation. A most important task facing the government is making such a transition less painful and affording maximum protection to the strata of the population that can under no circumstances be a casualty of the reform being implemented. I refer primarily to pensioners, large families, students, and people on a fixed income such as teachers, doctors, and servicemen.

[Rytov] There arises here, evidently, not only a philosophical but also the simple quotidian question of methods of compensation for possible losses.

[Abalkin] For the said strata of the population the state should assume the function of compensation and make restitution in full for a possible decline in the living standard resulting from price rises.

[Rytov] What about other strata of the population, those employed in social production? Who will compensate their losses?

[Abalkin] For those employed in social production the compensation will not be the covering of possible losses but freedom of economic activity. It is a question of the possibility of improving production and reorganizing its structure with regard for changing demand, and of choosing the most rational forms and methods of management. Working efficiently and receiving appropriately according to one's labor contribution.

[Rytov] Nonetheless, let us return, Leonid Ivanovich, to the progress of the economic reform. What needs to be done in order to advance more decisively?

[Abalkin] In order to move successfully forward we need to rid ourselves of the burden or ballast that is holding back the steps of the reform and impeding the transition to modern management methods. It is a question of growing imbalance in the economy and a tremendous amount of nonmaterialized and essentially devalued money. It is a question, furthermore, not only of the consumer sphere, where pent-up demand has reached R165 billion, but of the production sphere also. Until the demand for material and technical resources is appreciably exceeded by supply, flexible production responsive to social changes will be simply impossible. Until then violations of economic relationships, regional exclusiveness, and what has come to be called industrial racketeering or simply extortion will flourish. And so

things will continue until we have succeeded in stabilizing the market and until we have just one shortage—a shortage of money. Ultimately all reforms come down to precisely this problem, and it must be solved. The knot must be cut. How this should be done is clear enough.

Economic science, both national and foreign, contains an entirely particular sum total of measures with which such a task may be tackled. The problem is not that we do not know how to do this. It is a question of the political will and readiness of society to agree to a decisive renewal of the outmoded economic structures.

[Rytov] Unfortunately, we have in recent months repeatedly encountered the crudest and most insulting attacks on economic science and prominent economists. Leonid Ivanovich, I know that you personally treat the criticism that has descended on us with enviable composure. Nonetheless, to be candid, what effort is this costing?

[Abalkin] We are today incensed by methods, well known from the past, when people who were incompetent but endowed with authority permitted themselves to teach artists how to paint pictures, and writers how to depict contemporary reality. This now seems to us absurd and unacceptable. Public opinion is quite unanimous here. But for some reason it is considered perfectly permissible to just as arrogantly and incompetently instruct the economists, airily reject their recommendations, and propose measures dictated not so much by knowledgeability as the emotions and passions that seethe at mass meetings. To no less an extent than art, science needs to be protected not only from the arbitrary action of incompetent superiors but also from the pressure of the crowd.

Everyone recalls, evidently, the scene staged at the special Congress of People's Deputies. It was a question of new attempts to compromise the government program and its activity and cast a shadow on the people working in N.I. Ryzhkov's cabinet. Is this the way to behave? Is it possible, having quite recently, following the keenest debate, approved the government's economic recovery program, to subsequently immediately, even before the ink on the documents that were signed is dry, attempt to call in question this program, which was dictated by an endeavor to extricate the economy from a most serious situation, a program of balanced and realistic measures?

Just because some people do not like it.

People who are attempting to throw wrenches into the works of realization of the scheduled measures are frequently guided by the principle: The worse the state of affairs in the economy, the better for our ends. We can understand people's desire to come to power and take their place in government offices. In a situation of political struggle and the formation of a multiparty system this could seem natural. But one thing cannot be permitted: playing on the fate of millions of people and making these people hostages to political ambition. This is impermissible and amoral.

[Rytov] Forgive me, Leonid Ivanovich, but we need now, perhaps, to return once again to the government's economic recovery program. Facts are facts, there is no getting away from them....

[Abalkin] The results of the development of the economy in the first months of the present year and an analysis of the plans that have been adopted by the enterprises, availing themselves of the independence they have acquired, do not inspire optimism. We have not yet halted the growth of negative processes. For three consecutive months, from December 1989 through February 1990, there has been an absolute decline in production. The losses caused by strikes, the closure of enterprises, transport holdups, and interethnic conflicts are growing. The implementation of measures aimed at the relatively smooth development of events is becoming unrealistic. Consequently, measures of a more radical nature, strong medicines, and urgent means are needed.

We could and, most likely, need to go back once again to the recovery program and bring it into line with the changed conditions and fundamental changes in the organization of power connected with the introduction of the office of president. But even here we may look for success only on the condition that, following discussion of the adjustments to the policy that has been mapped out, we finally come together and do not hinder but help one another in emerging from the crisis situation in the economy.

[Rytov] In this connection, Leonid Ivanovich, I have one further question. I am attempting to understand and evaluate different viewpoints. I read all the works of Gavriil Kharitonovich Popov, Otto Rudolfovich Latsis, Yegor Timurovich Gaydar, Vasiliy Illarionovich Selyunin, Nikolay Petrovich Shmelev.... And then also the works of Tatyana Ivanovna Koryagina, a member of your commission and people's deputy of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic].

I am familiar with G.Kh. Popov only from his works. The rest I know personally. These are serious people. Why, then, are the majority of them speaking in opposition to you and not participating in the program you have drawn up? I refer to the recent speech by Doctor of Economic Sciences N.P. Shmelev at the special Congress of People's Deputies. On this occasion also he declared that the government program was not bad but that it had one shortcoming: it was half-baked and bore the traces precisely of this "sitting on two stools." The way out of the crisis situation, the speaker maintained, cannot be painless: a great price has to be paid for great mistakes. What, Leonid Ivanovich, is your attitude toward such criticism? And what do you see as mistakes made by the government?

[Abalkin] As usual, I interpreted Nikolay Petrovich Shmelev's speech ambivalently. Together with a serious analysis of the problems and the criticism of the half-baked nature of the measures adopted, which is correct in principle—"attempts to sit on two stools"—much in

his speech was chiefly of an emotional nature. The constructive part of his program is for this reason not all that clear. A professional economist, a person engaged in political activity all the more, cannot permit himself to confine himself to slogan-mongering.

You do not have to be a scholar to understand that mistakes always have to be paid for. This is elementary common sense.

For big mistakes a big price has to be paid. There is nothing new here. The whole question, which requires precisely a professional approach, is the extent of this price, the timeframe in which it must be paid and, finally, who must pay? Can this price be distributed to all equally? Does society have the moral right to impose this payment on weak and defenseless people?

You cannot implement policy and appeal to the masses for support for this policy without having answered these questions.

In any event, a government which, I am sure, expresses the wishes of the people's deputies who elected it cannot take steps without having given a clear answer to all these questions. I have had to say repeatedly that the government's economic recovery program is an open program. It is prepared to accept all reasonable recommendations, practical advice, and alternatives of conceptual solutions. Incidentally, it incorporates much of what has been suggested by scientists, commentators, people's deputies, including those you cited.

I, as a scientist, am very much disturbed by the fact that many of my colleagues are increasingly squandering their professional qualities and acting as commentators. But the people perceive them as scientists, as serious and responsible people basing their conclusions on in-depth analysis, precise calculations, and well-considered forecasts. You cannot substitute emotions for them.

As far as my attitude toward criticism that is predominantly of an emotional nature is concerned, it cannot, naturally, be perceived as something pleasant. But one ultimately starts to get used even to this. On one condition: just as long as it does not impede practical work.

[Rytov] However, Leonid Ivanovich, our conversation has been of a particularly candid nature. Have there been mistakes in the implementation of the economic reform? What do you think, yes or no?

[Abalkin] The reform, to speak of economic reform, is actually into its third year of implementation. I mean that the fundamental decisions on its implementation were adopted in June 1987 and came to be implemented as of 1988, when the Enterprise Act and then the Cooperatives Act initially took effect.

I consider most important, perhaps, two shortcomings in implementation of the reform. First, its noncomprehensive implementation, when, for example, enterprise independence was not buttressed by the corresponding changes in the methods of planning their activity, the introduction of tax limitations, changes in pricing, and restructuring in other components of the economic mechanism. The noncomprehensive, nonconcerted implementation of the measures prevented us from obtaining the anticipated results.

The slowness of the steps being implemented and the postponement and prolongation of urgent transformations concerning, specifically, the restructuring of credit policy, transition to wholesale trade in producer goods and others are the second shortcoming. It is as a result of this that the particular situation where the old system of management has been done away with and the new one has yet to be created has taken shape.

[Rytov] And yet and yet and yet.... The shortest distance between two points is a straight line. Are you confident, Leonid Ivanovich, that it will emerge?

[Abalkin] Economic reform is possible only given the necessary firmness in implementation of the policy that has been formulated. But this firmness has been lacking, unfortunately. This has been manifested most recently even. The government has resignedly given way on a number of issues under pressure from the unions and the mass public mood. On such issues as the introduction of commercial trade, the holding of auctions, raising the price of energy resources, and freight shipment tariffs. There is no consistency in exercise of tax regulation of the wage fund. A constant change of course—progress not along a straight line but in zigzag manner—is taking place, as it were.

It is not hard to understand that this requires extra efforts and is bringing the set goal closer only slowly. Work on explaining the essence of the economic recovery program has been organized inadequately. A system for studying public opinion and its influence, which is so necessary today, and work with the public and the mass media are practically absent from the government machinery. We can complain about the media and take umbrage at them as much as we like, but we will not put matters right by bearing grudges. What is needed is a well-considered, well-oiled system of work under the conditions of the ongoing democratization of society and the politicization of the masses.

I repeat once again, we should not take umbrage but act energetically and in a planned manner, and know how not only to formulate a sound program but also defend it, persuade of its advantages a broad strata of the population and, if necessary, defend this program in open struggle also, refuting opponents' rebukes or inventions.

[Rytov] Leonid Ivanovich, what credit of trust, in your view, does our government enjoy?

[Abalkin] The credit of trust enjoyed by any government cannot be indefinite. Society expects, and with perfect justification, a real improvement in matters in the economy. The processes occurring in this sphere are developing very ambivalently. There are a number of shoots which could lead to an improvement in the

situation. One of them is conversion in the defense complex, which is gaining momentum and which should even within the present year be producing a marked replenishment for the consumer market.

Many changes could occur in respect of an improvement in the situation on the regional consumer markets in connection with the renewal of the soviets and their endowment with quite wide-ranging authority pertaining to the development of the consumer sphere, housing, general amenity construction, and the production of consumer goods and of enterprises of the agro-industrial complex.

However, these shoots may rise and strengthen given a general stabilization of monetary circulation and of the country's financial activity. Together with the measures that have already been mapped out in the government program a number of additional measures, although they may hardly be implemented in full in the present year, are required. And now, immediately.

The government must realize the corresponding actions provided for in the president's program statement. It is a question of measures to tighten fiscal expenditure and hold back credit resources going into the national economy. However, all this together may produce results only on condition of a recovery in the social atmosphere and on condition that we finally get down to work.

I realize full well that this phrase sounds unconvincing, that people are fed up with appeals for work, and that things cannot be changed by appeals alone. I am fully aware of all this. Nonetheless, this is also the truth.

I shall return to the fact that production is declining and losses growing. We frequently criticize our statistics for unrealistic indicators and for the fact that the growth rate has traditionally been measured in cost terms and that the actual results have been overstated. But even given such measurements, we manufactured in January 1 percent less industrial output than in January of last year, and in February again 1 percent less than in February 1989. The State Committee for Statistics is hardly deliberately making the state of affairs in the economy worse. And if we agree with these estimates, improving results is impossible, whatever is done with resources, given a decline in the amount of production.

Some 200 000 persons were not working daily on average in January-February alone in connection with strikes and interethnic conflicts. Twice as many as in September 1989, when the "peak" of mass no-shows was observed.

In the same two months the production of oil declined four percent, and coal six percent, compared with January-February 1989. The production of trucks and buses declined three and 11 percent respectively. And the manufacture of men's socks and women's knee socks declined one percent and five percent at union republic enterprises of the ministries of light industry.

We want society to be different. We want to live better, but for this we ourselves must become different and work differently. Banal, but true.

### Comparison of Report on Industrial Decline

*PM1104090190*

Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian on 7 April 1990 publishes in its Moscow Evening Edition on page 1 an article by V. Romanyuk under the rubric "Statistics and Our Commentary" and the headline "First Quarter: No Acceleration As Yet." Comparison of the IZVESTIYA 7 April Moscow Evening Edition item with the version carried in IZVESTIYA 8 April Morning Edition, which was published on pages 47-48 of the 9 April Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, reveals the following variation:

Page 48, second full paragraph, last sentence reads: "...towels and footwear.

The quantity of food goods is increasing slowly, extremely slowly, on the store shelves. The purchase of cattle and poultry in the first quarter of 1990 declined four percent compared with the first quarter of 1989 while the purchase of eggs declined by the same figure and processing was reduced accordingly. The production of edible fish produce, flour from grain in state stocks, and pasta remained at last year's level (the increase was 0.3-0.6 percent). Four percent more margarine was produced while milk and whole milk produce production increased three and two percent respectively, but two percent less vegetable oil was produced than in the first quarter of 1989.

An enterprise's economic..." (supplying additional paragraph).

## Agricultural

### Peasants, Equipment Not Ready for Spring

*PM1004092790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 6 Apr 90 Morning Edition p 1*

["Topics of the Day" agricultural review by V. Gavrichkin: "How the Peasants Are Greeting the Spring"]

[Text] The April sun is a reminder to everyone: No matter how torrid the political events in the country might be, by no means do they banish or replace the concerns of the land—concern for our daily bread. How have the peasants greeted the field work season? And have there been any special, marked changes?

Perhaps not. At first glance, everything is developing in accordance with the usual scenario. Even the early spring came as a surprise, as ever—many people were caught napping. This is not an abstract judgment, but one based on State Committee for Statistics reports. One, two, and three years ago, when assessing, for example, readiness of equipment for spring field work, we would traditionally

say that for some items the situation was a little better, but for others it was on a par with the previous year or a little worse. Today, however, no matter what item you take—tractors, trucks, cultivators, plows or drills—nearly everything is worse. Not a lot worse, between one and four percent, but, given the volumes we are talking about, one percent means thousands of units!

Now is scarcely the time or place to explore each specific cause. Anyway, they are well known: a shortage of spare parts, lax equipment delivery discipline, and poor organization of repair work. Yes, because the command-and-administratve system, on which it all used to hinge, has been weakened. Good riddance, you might say. But there is something worse: While deliberately relaxing the administrative levers, we have failed to create strong enough levers of economic interest.

As a result the diktat of the enterprises supplying the countryside has increased rather than decreased. This is evidenced by the endless violations of contract deliveries and the prices that keep on rising with impressive regularity. Only the market can put everything in order. But the market presupposes equal relationships between independent partners. But there is no sign of this at the moment. Nevertheless, an unfree partner is continuing to dictate terms to another partner, unfree, like him.

The surprising thing is that despite all this the equipment is out in the fields and the spring work is proceeding pretty smoothly. The southern farmers made good use of any fine days in February; they are now tending the winter-sown fields and have practically finished sowing the early spring crops. The vegetable plantations are being established. In southern parts of the Central Asian republics they have started sowing cotton.

One has heard the argument that the new bosses—lease collectives—realize their potential when things are running smoothly. One should not be too hasty in arriving at such conclusions. After all, everyone knows that an intrafarm lessee is not independent and he is in very much a halfway house situation. It is an impossible situation being only half an owner. It results in nothing but absurd distortions, since short-term interests that bear no relation to the actual end result still prevail.

In Stavropol Kray, for example, when the farmers got into the fields they suddenly found that more than 1,000 tractors were still stuck in farm workshops and vehicle yards, and what is more, the number of farm vehicle yards had fallen from 316 to 247. Moreover, there were nearly 1,000 fewer skilled troubleshooters and field repairmen.

It appeared to be a good thing: A smaller workforce can handle the work. But in the spring every hour is valuable. And equipment is still breaking down in the fields. Apparently, the collectives of intrafarm lessees, who are more concerned with today, than with tomorrow's harvest, decided to "economize" on maintenance. An economy of that kind would never have occurred to a full-fledged boss.

An isolated example, you might say. But it is indicative of a trend, which quite clearly demonstrates how futile it is to touch up existing economic systems without radically changing anything. Even new legal acts will be powerless unless they are reinforced by a rigorous mechanism.

Remember how the people's deputies rushed the Law on Land through—we must make it by the spring! And they made it. The other day I was called by representatives of the local peasant association in Kirov Oblast and told that in their vain efforts to get land allocated to them for independent farming they had even gone as far as the oblast soviet executive committee [oblispolkom]. But what they heard there was: "This law is a mistake and we will not be in any hurry to implement it."

So there you have it. The law is there, we are waiting for changes, but the officials whom the law expects to implement these changes still have their doubts. I admit that these doubts will last at least until the fundamentals of the union law on land are reinforced by republican legislative acts. Certain doubts are perfectly understandable. Practice has already shown that given today's prices for agricultural products and the present system of purchases of these products and material and technical supplies in the countryside, many independent farmers or lessees find it hard to survive without collaborating with a kolkhoz [collective farm] or sovkhoz [state farm]. But it is time we realized that many current kolkhozes and sovkhozes will also fail to survive in market and market competition conditions without state subsidies. Unless they are turned into a new type of farm—a kind of association of free farmers, cooperative workers, and lessees.

The revival of land ownership is not a single step, but a process.. A slow, painful, difficult process. The first spring days in the fields show that a step has been taken, but the process itself has not yet started.

## Agricultural Developments for 15-21 March

*LD2203022790*

[Editorial Report] The following is a compilation of reports on agricultural developments in the USSR carried by Moscow Domestic Service in Russian on 15-21 March, unless indicated otherwise. Times of broadcast, given in GMT, are in parentheses at the end of each item.

15 March:
No significant developments reported.

16 March:
Sowing has begun in Chimkent and Dzhambul Oblasts, the southernmost oblasts in Kazakhstan. (1100)

17-21 March:
No significant developments reported.

## Scientific

### 'Cosmos-2072' Satellite Launched 13 April

*LD1404103990 Moscow TASS in English 1026 GMT 14 Apr 90*

[Text] Moscow, Apr 14 (TASS)—Another artificial earth satellite, Cosmos-2072 was launched by the Soyuz carrier-rocket in the Soviet Union on 13 April 1990. The satellite carries scientific apparatus for continuing space research.

The satellite has been placed in an orbit with the following parameters:

—Initial period of revolution: 89 minutes;
—Apogee: 248 km;
—Perigee: 189 km;
—Orbital inclination—64.8 degrees.

Besides scientific apparatus, the satellite carries a radio system for the precise measurement of orbital elements and a radiotelemetry system for transmitting to earth data about the work of the instruments and scientific apparatus.

The apparatus aboard the satellite is working normally.

The coordinating and computing center is processing the incoming information.

### 'Foton' Satellite Parameters Reported

*PM1304135790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 Apr 90 Second Edition p 2*

[TASS report: "Foton Launched"]

[Text] The latest Foton artificial earth satellite was launched in the Soviet Union 11 April 1990 via a Soyuz booster rocket to continue research into space material technology.

During the 16-day flight program it is planned to carry out experiments to obtain protein crystals and semiconductor materials with improved qualities under microgravity conditions and also to test technology for their experimental-industrial production.

In accordance with a commercial agreement, Foton also carries scientific research equipment for France's National Space Research Center.

The satellite has been placed in an orbit with the following parameters:

—initial period of revolution: 90.5 minutes;
—maximum distance from earth's surface (apogee): 398 km;
—minumum distance from earth's surface (perigee): 225 km;
—inclination of orbit: 62.8 degrees.

The on-board equipment is functioning normally.

The coordination and computer center is processing the incoming information.

### Cosmonautics Day Celebrated 12 Apr

*LD1204224990 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 12 Apr 90*

[From the "Vremya" newscast; video report by S. Slipchenko]

[Text] Today is Cosmonautics Day—a fine and glorious festival in honor of our triumphs. But nowadays we mark even such triumphal dates by recalling more than just the achievements and successes.

[Slipchenko] One might now call Soviet cosmonautics 30 years of discoveries and untapped possibilities. The secret doors are opening with tortuous slowness and we discover that the Kompozit scientific production association long ago created unique materials and technology without parallel in the world, and that the machines in which they are used are being purchased both by Japan and the United States—to whom we now so often turn. [video shows archive footage of a rocket launch, followed by pictures of a display of materials]

This here is the plant of the Metalworking and Machine-Building Research Institute [Niimetmash], which created an aerial for the Aktivnyy international space project. This experience of course enhanced the quality of developments for heavy industry throughout the country. [video shows close up of work produced at the institute]

The Energiya scientific production association has been developing plans for a heavy space platform to solve communications problems. [video shows wall diagrams portraying platform]

This is another project for a system of communications that is being developed by two purely space firms—the Astra scientific production association and the Prikladnaya Mekhanika [applied mechanics] scientific production association. Formerly, it must be owned, they were fulfilling orders for the Defense Ministry. Now they are counting on covering the country with communications lines in the years 1992-93 by means of space facilities that already exist. After all, there is only an average of one and a half telephones for 10,000-15,000 people in most of the country's territory. [video shows wall diagram of Marafon [Marathon] satellite communications system network using mobile and remote installations]

You are now seeing fragments from material that has not previously been broadcast. Do we know much about space projects? Do we know that 20 years ago Soviet man was due to land on the moon and the technology had been created. Here are the remains of a rocket that came down during a test. The project was closed down and the achievements were kept secret. This means that progress too was halted. [video shows debris of rocket scattered over terrain]

This is the story not only of cosmonautics but indeed of our country. A single droplet of water is salty just as the whole sea is. Similarly the droplet of cosmonautics is now, as it were, made up of contradictions—just as the whole sea of our economy and industry is. This sector is urgently making medical equipment, but the Institute of Medicobiological Problems has insufficient funds for science and for new equipment. Money has been allocated for scientific research under the Mars-94 international project, while there is no money for the creation of the apparatus in which science must fly. [video shows various types of medical equipment]

How then is one to mark Cosmonautics Day? It seems to me that one should bow low to Anatoliy Solovev and Aleksandr Balandin who are now working in orbit and to all the people in this vast sector who have made our country a power, and which alone is referred to throughout the world as the jewel in the crown of Soviet industry. [video shows Solovev and Balandin in orbit; and carrier rocket on launching pad]

## Mars Mission Financial Difficulties Described

*LD1304030190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1804 GMT 12 Apr 90*

[Text] Moscow, 12 Apr (TASS)—"The present level of our knowledge now makes it possible to discover new 'secrets' about Mars. The main aim of the planned 'Mars-94' project is to carry out a detailed collection of data about the planet prior to its actual exploration, which will probably take place soon." This opinion was expressed at a press conference held here today by Albert Galeyev, director of the Institute of Space Research of the USSR Academy of Science, the principal organization involved in the implementaion of the national "Mars" program.

The press conference was attended by representatives of the National Aeronautic and Space Administration, NASA, and by specialists from the Jet Propulsion Laboratory at Pasadena in the United States, from the French National Center for Space Research, and other scientific organizations. Altogether, 21 countries are taking part in the preparations for the "Mars-94" project.

The Soviet specialist recalled that the project envisages the launch in 1994 of two spacecraft equipped with up-to-date scientific apparatus. They will put two satellites into orbit around Mars. The satellites will transmit back to earth data about the surface of this planet, its ionosphere and the plasma surrounding it. Furthermore, two air balloons will be detached from the spacecraft to study the meteorological conditions of the planet.

Referring to the problems of financing the project, Albert Galeyev noted that the USSR State Commitee for Science and Technology allocated for this year the necessary funds for the development of the scientific equipment, i.e. R20 million. However, the question of financing the manufacture of the spacecraft and booster rockets, for which the Ministry of General Machine-Building is responsible, has still not been resolved. Our internal financial difficulties, Albert Galeyev said, could have a negative effect on the implementation of the international project as a whole. All in all, the scientist said the implementation of the project requires about R500 million.

After the success of the United States's Viking-1 and Viking-2 Mars projects, during which a great deal of scientific data was obtained, Albert Galeyev noted, we hesitated for a long time before deciding to go ahead with a new and more detailed study of the planet. However, it might cost mankind consderably more to go on deferring important research for years and decades.

## Baltic Republics

### Lithuanian Moscow Representative Updates Situation

*LD1604102190 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 0900 GMT 16 Apr 90*

[Telephone interview with E. Bickauskas, republic of Lithuania representative in Moscow, by correspondent Guoda Salciute on 15 April; from the "Lithuania Today" new program—recorded]

[Excerpt] [Salciute] [passage omitted] You must have guessed that my intention to phone you was not just to ask you about the Easter holiday. What's the news in Moscow since the two days given as a warning have now expired?

[Bickauskas] You know I have no special news, although the mission is working today here in Moscow. We are working because we are aware of the difficult situation and we know that there could be some news. However, we have not received any news through official channels.

In general, people from Moscow and correspondents come here and ask what the situation in Lithuania is in connection with the statement made by the president and chairman of the Council of Ministers. They sympathize with us.

Some time ago we had an interesting meeting with representatives of the People's Fronts of Leningrad and Moscow. They would like to send a large delegation to Lithuania in the capacity of people's diplomats. Yes, concern about the events is felt in Moscow. [passage omitted]

### Lithuanian Leadership Meets on Response to Moscow

*AU1604102090 Paris AFP in English 0946 GMT 16 Apr 90*

[Text] Moscow, April 16 (AFP)—The Lithuanian leadership cut short its Easter break Monday to consider its response to Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev's threat of economic sanctions if the republic fails to repeal laws linked to its secessionist stand.

Both the Council of Ministers and the Supreme Soviet's Presidium, headed by President Vytautas Landsbergis, were meeting despite the public holiday, for the first time since the war, the parliament's press office said.

The meeting comes in the wake of Friday's ultimatum by Mr. Gorbachev and Prime Minister Nikolai Ryzhkov who warned of economic sanctions, possibly involving oil and gas supplies, if the rebel republic failed to repeal a series of new laws within two days.

Mr. Landsbergis first said the Lithuanian leaders would ignore the threat, then on Saturday suggested that parliament would consider the Moscow ultimatum on Tuesday, after the Easter break. "Because of the Easter holidays, the government's warning can only be examined by the parliament and government of the republic on Tuesday. It is possible that an official reply will be adopted then," he said.

Friday's letter by Messrs. Gorbachev and Ryzhkov gave Lithuanian authorities until midnight on Sunday to repeal new laws adopted since its March 11 unilateral declaration of independence, failing which "orders will be given to cut off various supplies to Lithuania". It was the first time the Kremlin had made specific any threat to the republic.

The Lithuanian leadership had earlier rejected calls by Moscow for it to back down on its independence declaration, saying it was ready to discuss anything save the principle of independence itself.

The specific laws referred to by Mr. Gorbachev and Mr. Ryzhkov in their Friday ultimatum concern the creation of identity cards for Lithuanians and a call for a boycott of conscription into the Soviet Army. At the same time, the Kremlin leaders suggested that if Lithuania bowed to their ultimatum, negotiations could begin at once on all the Lithuania's demands.

The press office in Vilnius said the republic's leadership was expected to hammer out a joint response to Mr. Gorbachev, but it denied this was being done in an atmosphere of crisis.

On Saturday, Mr. Landsbergis had also warned that his republic could create economic problems for the Soviet Union by not supplying it with a number of products. Lithuania notably maintains aircraft engines and produces nearly two-thirds of electric engines for household equipment manufactured in the Soviet Union.

On Sunday, as the mostly-Roman-Catholic Lithuanians took part in Easter celebrations, the archbishop, Cardinal Vincencas Slackvicius, called in his sermon, later broadcast on local television, for people to stand together in response to Soviet pressure.

Pope John Paul II sent a message of support to Lithuanian Catholic Church leaders saying he felt "closer than ever to the aspirations of the Lithuanian people".

Meanwhile, a number of military garrisons in Lithuania have called on Mr. Gorbachev to introduce presidential rule over the rebel republic, INTERFAX, a Moscow-Radio news digest reported.

Some garrisons also expressed concern that the Kremlin was failing to take concrete action over the secessionist threat.

### Lithuanian Foreign Ministry Issues Statement

*LD1404075490 Vilnius International Service in Lithuanian 2100 GMT 13 Apr 90*

[Text] Today the Lithuanian government news agency ELTA published a Lithuanian Foreign Ministry statement on the Soviet Union's attempts to isolate Lithuania. The republic of Lithuania Foreign Ministry, says the statement, is watching with great anxiety and concern the policy of diplomatic isolation pursued by the Soviet Union toward Lithuania. The issue of visas to parliamentarians of foreign countries, representatives of international organizations, diplomats, and journalists is refused. Recently entry visas were refused to a delegation of Swedish cultural workers headed by the Swedish deputy minister of foreign affairs, a delegation of the Luxembourg parliament, and a group of U.S. senators. According to available information, the issue of visas to a group of French parliamentarians is also being refused.

In the Lithuanian Foreign Ministry's opinion, these steps by the Soviet Union have no juridical or moral justification and violate the republic of Lithuania's sovereign rights.

The Lithuanian Foreign Ministry expects that in the future the Soviet Union will not pursue the isolation policy and thus will demonstrate its loyalty to the principles of democracy and the Helsinki concluding act.

### Gorbachev Remarks About Lithuania, Party Split

*OW1304214390 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 1400 GMT 13 Apr 90*

[Text] We had already reported that on the eve of the 21st Congress of the Young Communist League [Komsomol], Soviet President Gorbachev met with the delegates to the congress. Now, we would like to dwell upon the situation of the meeting. Our station reporter pointed out: All types of questions were posed to the president. Can the position and power of the president be turned into dictatorship and into an issue of relations between the presidential system and the Communist Party, because Gorbachev now assumes two posts—leader of the state and the party? Naturally, questions about the possibility of a party split and a multiparty system at the 28th CPSU Congress were also raised.

Comrade Gorbachev said: [Gorbachev heard speaking briefly in Russian, fading into announcer's voice] Long before the opening of this congress, we had already put forward the guiding principle for actions of the CPSU and the plan for humanitarian and democratic socialism, and announced the new draft regulations for which we had accepted many proposals from the party and society. It is possible that we will debate and discuss all these issues in the congress. I believe that we will unite under a strong party with a new look, which will carry out its activities within the scope of a new society and in a democratic and pluralistic atmosphere. The party will conduct dialogue with social organizations that have similar goals. Right now, there are signs of splits in the party. Some people join the party, while others withdraw from it. On the one hand, it is a natural process, while on the other hand, some people withdraw from the party without trying to understand the situation. This has aroused our concerns.

Many issues were about the rights for self-governing of the Soviet Republics. He also talked about Lithuania. Gorbachev said: [Gorbachev heard speaking briefly in Russian, fading into announcer's voice] The rights and economic independence of various republics should be realistic so that they may develop their own culture and traditions. The same thing applies to various autonomous republics and regions. We have already taken this path, and have done immense amounts of work in this connection. This is a correct way. As for the Lithuanian issue, the central authorities have tried to influence the Lithuanian authorities on the basis of the resolutions adopted at the third congress. What the president meant was the Third Soviet People's Congress. The congress held that the resolutions of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet are incorrect. Lithuania is a part of the USSR. Its constitutional government should be protected. Personal relations, relations in the fields of science and technology, as well as regional relations [between Lithuania and other republics] have completely broken off. Resolutions were adopted within a month without consulting the people. The Lithuanian authorities have announced their withdrawal from the USSR without a referendum. This is an adventure and coup d'etat during a dark night.

The delegates to the Komsomol congress also raised questions on the young people and on their role in the society. Someone asked Gorbachev if he is bringing up young successors to the Soviet presidency. They may well be in this hall, replied Gorbachev.

### Landsbergis Rejects Cancellation of Independence

*LD1404143190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1315 GMT 14 Apr 90*

[Text] Vilnius, 14 Apr (TASS)—Vytautas Landsbergis, chairman of the Supreme Soviet of Lithuania, has categorically rejected the possibility of cancelling the act on restoration of the sovereign Lithuanian State which was adopted by the republic's parliament on 11 March.

He made this statement in his interview to the U.S. television company NBC in connection with yesterday's warning from USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev and Nikolay Ryzhkov, head of the Soviet Government, to the parliament and the government of this Baltic republic. The USSR leaders announced the possible discontinuance of supplies of some important types of produce to Lithuania in response to a whole set of acts adopted by the Lithuanian legislators which contradict the USSR Constitution. In contrast with the West, economic relations between the republics of the Soviet Union are governed not by the market, but mainly by administrative levers, and prices are set by the the all-Union bodies.

Kasimiera Prunskiene, prime minister of Lithuania, stated in her interview to Czechoslovakia's PRACE newspaper that in case of an "economic blockade by the USSR," Lithuania might run into big problems with fuel. She reported about negotiations with the FRG and Switzerland, which are taking place at the moment, on printing Lithuanian bank notes in these countries to replace the Soviet rubles on the territory of Lithuania. The republic's head of government stressed that the Lithuania's contacts with the West, aimed at establishing comprehensive economic links, have been "strongly stepped up."

### Landsbergis Comments on Blockade Threat

*LD1404184390 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 14 Apr 90*

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] We have just received a TASS report about a news conference given by Landsbergis, chairman of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet:

They are continuing to demand the impossible from us. It is a method of putting off talks and attempting to make out that Lithuania does not want talks, Landsbergis, chairman of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet, said at the news conference. He was commenting on the message from USSR President Gorbachev, and Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers Ryzhkov, which was sent to the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet and Council of Ministers. It is published today in Lithuania's republican papers. [Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1800 GMT on 14 April in a similar report adds: "In Landsbergis' words, the Soviet Union has been conducting a psychological and political war against Lithuania up to now, but an economic war is now beginning."]

On Monday Lithuania celebrates Easter, Landsbergis said. This issue will be examined in the republic's parliament and government on 17 April and it is possible that some document will be worked out, he noted. In reply to journalists' questions, the head of the parliament said it is so far unknown whether a full or partial blockade or a restriction on individual spheres of Lithuania's economy will be applied.

He said: Lithuania could also create some difficulties for the Soviet Union's economy by failing to supply particular products, but so far we have attempted to fulfill all of our contractual obligations. If the supplies we withhold affect particular branches of the Soviet economy, it will not be our fault.

The chairman of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet did not mention the possibility of adopting decisions that would restore the situation in the republic to its condition before 10 March 1990. A question on whether, in connection with the statement, a change is to be expected in the positions held by the leadership of the Lithuanian republic, or a softening of them, evoked the following response: Our position is as mild as possible.

### Landsbergis Says Sanctions Might Be 'Useful'

*LD1504140590 Vilnius International Service in English 2130 GMT 14 Apr 90*

[Text] Vytautas Landsbergis, chairman of the Lithuanian parliament, has said that Lithuania will not react to the Soviet ultimatum. According to Vytautas Landsbergis, economic sanctions are going to take effect only gradually and in the long run they might be even useful to Lithuania, for it will be forced to develop its economy on its own.

### Landsbergis Interviewed on Current Conflict

*AU1504173890 Vienna KURIER in German 15 Apr 90 p 5*

[Telephone interview with Vytautas Landsbergis, president of the Lithuanian parliament, by Conny Bischofsberger on 12 April: "Let Us Finally Talk With One Another, Gorbachev!"]

[Excerpts] [passage omitted]

[Bischofsberger] Do you consider Lithuania to be a danger to world peace?

[Landsberg- -oughs] If anybody endangers our peace it is Moscow with its attitude toward our desire for peace. The Lithuanian people have opted for independence. Now Gorbachev has intervened and demanded that we revoke our declaration. How can we do this? Moscow is demanding the impossible!

[Bischofsberger] Are you not ready to strike a compromise?

[Landsbergis] Before a compromise there has to be dialogue. Yet, Moscow is behaving very strangely in this respect: It rejects any dialogue, it absolutely refuses to talk to us!

[Bischofsberger] So how do you find out what Gorbachev thinks?

[Landsbergis, laughing] I do not! Gorbachev remains silent! He has not reacted to any of our letters, be it official petitions, press releases, or private notes. All we hear from Gorbachev are attempts to intimidate us and reprimands. The only thing that reminds us of him are tanks and military helicopters! [passage omitted]

[Bischofsberger] Where will all this lead, Mr. Landsbergis? After all, Lithuania is dependent on Moscow. Is time not against you?

[Landsbergis] Moscow is waging an economic war against us. There is only one possibility for resolving this crisis peacefully, and that is dialogue. I would like to tell the whole world: Let us finally talk with one another, Gorbachev! If we fail to establish this dialogue I fear the worst for the USSR.

[Bischofsberger] This means that the small republic would stand against the powerful USSR.

[Landsbergis, sighs] True, and then it might become dangerous! If a country as powerful as the USSR can invade and occupy a small country like Lithuania, and dissolve its constitution, then this is the greatest lie that has ever existed in world politics.

[Bischofsberger] Do you expect the crisis to change at Easter?

[Landsbergis] Gorbachev exactly knows that Easter means a lot to the people in the Western countries. The gap between the two positions will either narrow or Moscow will really demonstrate its strength. I hope for everybody that Moscow will not resort to using force.

[Bischofsberger] My last question: Where did you learn your English, it is excellent?

[Landsbergis] Here, in Vilnius. I am getting a lot of practice since the American television set up a station here.

### Prunskiene Responds to Gorbachev Warning

*LD1304211190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2010 GMT 13 Apr 90*

[By TASS correspondent Kazis Ustsila]

[Text] Vilnius, 13 Apr—Speaking late this evening on republican television, Lithuanian Prime Minister Kazimiera Prunskiene assessed the message from USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev and Nikolay Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, as a "threat."

The message from the USSR leaders says in particular that, unless the Supreme Soviet and government of Lithuania within two days cancel the acts and resolutions setting the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] in opposition to other republics and the Soviet Union as a whole, "instructions will be issued for a halt to the supplying to the Lithuanian SSR from other union republics of those types of output that are sold on the foreign market for freely convertible currency." Kazimiera Prunskiene refrained from making any comment, because this step "would really harm Lithuania." At the same time she noted that "if it does not sell us its output, the Soviet Union will not be able to demand unilateral supplies of output that foreign states eagerly purchase from Lithuania."

### Further on Reply

*LD1304222590 Vilnius International Service in English 2130 GMT 13 Apr 90*

[Excerpts] Moscow has today issued a concrete and outspoken warning to Lithuania. A letter signed by the Soviet Union's President Mikhail Gorbachev and Premier Nikolay Ryzhkov warns that in two days' time, unless Lithuania repeals its decision, Moscow will resort to serious economic sanctions which actually amount to an economic blockade. [passage omitted]

One cannot help noticing the document's timing with Easter eve and recalling the December of last year, when following the breakaway of the Lithuanian Communist Party, its leaders were summoned to Moscow during Christmas.

Commenting upon Moscow's warning on Lithuanian TV this evening was Prime Minster Kasimieras Prunskiene:

We don't see, she said, in what way our reactions are harming the Soviet Union and its republics. If only we (?regard it as harmful) our unwillingness to obey its claims to rule over us. Premier Kasimieras Prunskiene dismissed the accusations concerning political deadlock, pointing out that it was Moscow which was ignoring Lithuania's proposals to start talks immediately.

As to the economic blockade threats, Kasimieras Prunskiene voiced the idea that other states of the world might resort to similar economic measures against Moscow. On the other hand by refusing us supplies, Moscow will not be able to lay claims to our produce. While some of it is arousing the interests of other countries. [as heard].

Moscow's warning is (?of) certain concern to the Supreme Council and the Council of Ministers, said Kasimieras Prunskiene, but that should not spoil Easter. She also added that throughout the Christian world, even warring parties declare a truce.

### Ozolas Views Gorbachev 'Ultimatum'

*LD1404223590 Vilnius International Service in English 2130 GMT 14 Apr 90*

[Text] Deputy Prime Minister of Lithuania Romualdas Ozolas has told Radio Vilnius today that an answer to Mikhail Gorbachev and Nikolay Ryzhkov will be worked out on Monday by the Supreme Council of Lithuanian and the Lithuanian government. The Lithuanian government is now trying to find out what kind of produce concretely will be stopped being supplied to Lithuania, according to the Soviet ultimatum. According to Romualdas Ozolas, the ultimatum is more political than economic one. Mr. Ozolas does not see any problems that cannot be resolved. Moreover, Mikhail Gorbachev and Nikolay Ryzhkov have expressed hope that sanctions will not be needed. The only requirement of Moscow that is absolutely out of the question is the annullment of the act of the restoration of an independent Lithuanian state. The Lithuanian leadership is ready to discuss the rest of the issue enumerated by the Soviet ultimatum at any time and in any place together with representatives from Moscow.

### Lithuanian Official on Moscow Ultimatum

*LD1504142190 Vilnius International Service in English 2130 GMT 14 Apr 90*

[Text] Professor Aloyzas Sakalas, a Lithuanian MP [member of parliament], said that the ultimatum of yesterday [13 April] will not affect the work of the

Supreme Council of Lithuania. The ultimatum will be discussed, of course. However, the act of 11 March on the restoration of Lithuania's independence is not going to be repealed. The Lithuanian parliament has no mandate for doing this, noted Aloyzas Sakalas. He also added that in case the Soviet Union decides to sell part of its produce to Lithuania for hard currency only this step might be regarded as an indirect recognition of the republic of Lithuania. The Lithuanian government should also decide what kind of produce could be sold to the Soviet Union for hard currency as well. Thus, we are naturally nearing a free market, ended Mr. Sakalas.

### Lithuanians Stress Negotiations With Moscow

*LD1504144390 Vilnius International Service in English 2130 GMT 14 Apr 90*

[Text] Four representatives from Lithuania, namely Deputy Chairman of the Lithuanian parliament Bronius Kuzmickas, Deputy Prime Minister Romualdas Ozolas, the Lithuanian Foreign Minister Algirdas Saudargas and the diplomatic representative in Moscow Egidijus Bickauskas, yesterday met with a group of United States senators in Moscow. The meeting took place on the initiative of the American senators currently visiting the Soviet Union. The Lithuanian side confirmed once again its readiness to negotiate with Moscow on all debatable issues with the exception of one, and that is the independence of Lithuania.

### Lithuanian Reaction to Gorbachev Reported

*LD1404194690 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 14 Apr 90*

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Views of the situation in Lithuania among the citizens of the republic differ following the letter from the USSR president and the chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers to the Supreme Soviet and Council of Ministers of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic. The calls to dialogue which it contains have the support of many of those living in the republic. The only question is what position Lithuania's parliament will take in the present complex situation. Our correspondents have just reported from Vilnius.

[Begin recording] [Correspondent A. Barkhatov] The plenum of the Central Committee of the Lithuanian Communist Party on the CPSU platform discussed the main issues of preparing for the republic's party congress as well as yesterday's appeal from the president and premier of the USSR to the Supreme Soviet of Lithuania.

[R.A. Tvarijonas, first secretary of the Kaunas Town Committee of the Lithuanian Communist Party on the CPSU Platform—identified by caption]. It is, as it were, an answer, the logical answer to the decisions our parliament is taking while lacking the competence to do so.

[R.A. Matulaitis, first secretary of the Anvksciai Rayon Committee of the Lithuanian Communist Party on the CPSU platform—identified by caption] Registeration is now under way here, and also the effective replacement of passports by vistiing cards, by which Soviet people almost have to take an oath of allegiance to the Landsbergis government. This is anti-democratic. I have never encountered such an instance anywhere in the world.

[Barkhatov] There has been no official response from the republic's Supreme Soviet to the celebrated appeal as yet. All the same, we were given the opportunity of speaking to Kazimieras Motieka, deputy chairman of the Supreme Soviet of Lithuania.

[Motieka] We are prepared to discuss all questions bar one: that of the restoration of the independence of the Lithuanian state, please understand this. It talks about [as heard] the products for which the Soviet Union receives hard currency. That too could be the subject of talks in the future. If for example the Soviet Union wants Lithuania to pay for such products in foreign currency, I think our Council of Ministers would examine whether it is worthwhile paying such currency for it or not or whether, perhaps, to look for the same thing elsewhere, in other countries of the world.

[Barkhatov] But it is only two days. What are you going to do? Call an emergency session of the Supreme Soviet?

[Motieka] No, you know, we too have to be realists and that's just what we are. We don't see any great hurry here to find all the deputies and convene another session during the holidays. There simply is not any panic. The Supreme Soviet session is scheduled for Tuesday 17 April. That is when it will convene. We will have a read and look at what response or reaction we will adopt on the matter; and we will make every effort, I repeat, we will try to find contacts in order to begin talks. [video shows meeting in process, close-ups of officials interviewed, more of the meeting. Motieka in an informal lounge setting]. [end recording]

### Lithuanian Enactments 'Barrier to Talks'

*PM1304170390 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 13 Apr 90 p 3*

[N. Lashkevich report under "News From Republics" rubric: "What Do the Ministerial Portfolios Contain"; first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] A government has been formed in Lithuania. Will it be effective in today's conditions?

What kind of government is the new Lithuanian one. Will it be capable of leading the republic out of its economic crisis? Will the republic's declared independent status be the magic wand that will bring its inhabitants prosperity and a satisfied existence? There are many questions: specific, acute, and painful questions. But, as yet, equally clear and specific answers to them are rather thin on the ground.

So, over the last three weeks the republic's Supreme Soviet has completed its formation of a government cabinet. The number of ministries has been reduced by almost a third. I will name just a few of them: economy, industry, agriculture, foreign affairs, culture and education, communications, railways, internal affairs, and so on. Following parliamentary debates the initially created Territorial Protection Ministry, which served as a sort of prototype Defense Ministry, has after all been transformed into a department [departament]—such a word has indeed appeared in the official list of agencies [vedomstvo]. Accordingly, the sector departments [otdel], which formerly duplicated the work of ministries and agencies, have disappeared from the Council of Ministers. Special groups of assessors [referent] for the individual sectors of the economy will function in their place.

Proceeding from the just-adopted Law on the Government, the Council of Ministers is proposing to resolve "the republic's economic issues on the basis of the economic principles of management and the laws of the market economy." Fundamental to this is privatization. In agriculture the accent is on private farming [fermerstvo], although the equality of all forms of ownership is also proclaimed.

Such are the aims and the tasks. Will the present government cope with them? A loaded question, as they say, if you take into consideration its modest inheritance. The political instability is, alas, having an adverse impact on the economy. Looming on the horizon are strikes by certain enterprises whose labor collectives are dissatisfied with the political decisions of the Lithuanian parliament. A number of Vilnius plants and factories have already staged a one-hour warning strike which has cost hundreds of thousands of rubles. It is surprising but it is a fact: The Government of Lithuania, which, as we know, does not recognize USSR laws, has all the same deemed it possible to appeal to M.S. Gorbachev and N.I. Ryzhkov to halt the actions of the strike organizers. Where is the logic in this?

Let us note that the republic is striving to meet its contractual commitments to the USSR, and overall they have been 99.7 percent met. Nevertheless, in the fluid political situation many former and current suppliers in the union are refusing to conclude contracts or are demanding payment in cash. Deliveries of timber from Karelia and several other oblasts of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] are in jeopardy. As we can see, the governmewnt is faced with a great many problems.

True, in agriculture they are for the time being being resolved relatively easily. The Lithuanian peasantry is not rushing to join actively in the republic's turbulent sociopolitical life, which is full of unpredictable contradictions and consequences. So why have I nevertheless defined the prosperity as relative. Because it is largely thanks only to the reduction in planned deliveries of meat to union stocks that there is today a rich selection of meat and dairy products in the stores (150,000 tonnes of meat are to be delivered this year as against last year's 170,000 tonnes). But this is today.... What about tomorrow, when—let us say—the Tolyatti motor giant, in return for Zhigulis allocated in excess of resources, demands that its workers be provided with an uninterrupted supply of agricultural produce?

Another problem is that of finance. On the threshold of the announced monetary reform people are becoming increasingly uneasy and alarmed. At the end of the year the government is promising to withdraw the ruble from circulation and replace it with the lit. At what ratio will exchange be effected? Who will print the money, and where? As yet there is a dense fog on the financial horizon.

The market economy which the government is endeavoring to introduce in the republic will require free market prices. It is clear where this will lead in a current situation which is full of indeterminate prospects.

"It is still too early to introduce completely free market prices," asserts K.-D. Prunskiene, chairman of the Council of Ministers, "since this would entail a drop in people's living standards. Evidently, the state will moderate prices until there is an opportunity to balance the demands of producers and purchasers."

And again the question: What type of regulation? What will the price discrepancies be? In what proportions and on the basis of which laws of economics will this possible imbalance be eliminated?

As a whole the government does not yet possess a precisely argued, well-conceived program of economic transformations. For example, a new service has been established—a tax inspectorate. But what the tax ratio will be, and how the taxes will be levied has not been stated precisely. Instead of a clear-cut formula we have yet another declaration: The taxes, it is said, will not dissuade but will encourage a person to work productively.

As yet only one thing is certain: According to a claim by the new social security minister, A. Dobrovolskis, unemployment will rise because the structure of the farms is changing and the production makeup of many enterprises which are being transformed into privately owned facilities will require the retraining of the work force. In a word, in the immediate future the republic's inhabitants are facing—to put it bluntly—dismal prospects. Most of them will have to tighten their belts. "Better to be hungry but free"—a slogan that is, of course, alluring per se. But if we add a little more specific content to it in the form of economic computations and forecasts: What can the people expect?—then it's another matter.

Also unclear are prospects in the sphere of economic relations with the USSR, which, according to all the republic's legal provisions, is now a "foreign state." The Lithuanian Government proposes discussing the real

content of these relations during bilateral talks [peregovory]. However, the path to such talks is being blocked by the barriers of ever newer legislative acts erected by the Lithuanian parliament. Another impasse? But what would happen if the "foreign state" were to set world prices for imported and exported produce? The balance clearly will not be in Lithuania's favor.

All this is, of course, supposition: What if.... Yet all the same the conclusion is obvious: If the confrontation and opposition [konfrontatsiya, protivostoyaniye] grow, it will primarily be people who will suffer as a result. In my view, ambitions are out of place when it comes to the standard and quality of people's life, wherever they may live—in Moscow or a tiny Lithuanian village.

### Dobychin Interviewed on Work of Party Plenum

*LD1404164190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 14 Apr 90*

[Correspondent Gennadiy Kalenov report from Vilnius]

[Text] Briefly, on the events that have occurred here in Lithuania in the past week. The republic's Supreme Council has been in action—the new 17-strong ministerial cabinet headed by Prime Minister Kazimiera Prunskiene was presented to it. By and large the situation has been stable and normal.

Today, Saturday, there has been a plenum of the bureau of the Central Committee of the Lithuanian Communist Party (on the CPSU platform). Here is a tape of an interview given on the eve of the plenum by Vyacheslav Dobychin, first secretary of the Vilnius Oktyabrskiy Rayon Lithuanian Communist Party Committee:

[Begin Dobychin recording] Basically, this is a working plenum. There will be the first reading of the report which Burokevicius is to make at the congress. We will discuss the report. We will listen to people talking about the situation in the republic's rural areas. The first stage of the congress will take place on 21 April, when we will discuss the political report. There will be speeches and debates, and the basic political documents relating to the political report will be passed, and there will be elections to the now permanent Central Committee. The second stage will take place a month later, when we will discuss the documents for the 28th congress and elect our delegates to the 28th congress. And the third stage—we have decided to have three stages—will be after the 28th congress and after all the documents have been passed. I believe it would make sense to meet again (?before) the congress to discuss the decisions that are to be taken at the 28th congress. [end recording]

And now the reaction of the present leadership of the republic of Lithuania to yesterday's statement by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, our country's president, and Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers. Speaking on republican television today, Kazimieras Motieka, deputy chairman of the republic's Supreme Council, dealt with the recent decision on military service, stressing that everything in it was correct and again declaring the work of the Military Commissariat on the territory of Lithuania to be invalid. However, he left the Lithuanians with the right to do their military service on the territory of other states—presumably what is meant here is the Soviet Union. At the same time, he noted that they would not be prosecuted under the current laws of the republic of Lithuania. He again reaffirmed that the USSR Constitution does not function on its territory.

On the subject of yesterday's statement by the president of our country, Motieka said that Lithuania is ready to hold talks on all issues mentioned in the statement, apart from the repeal of the act of 11 March on independence and Lithuania's secession from the USSR. Responding to the timetable—the statement allowed two days—Motieka said that, since the Supreme Council is now in recess for Easter, and incidentally, Monday has been declared a holiday in Lithuania, an official response will only be forthcoming on Tuesday, 17 April.

### Lithuanian Party Central Committee Holds Plenum

*LD1404185590 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1824 GMT 14 Apr 90*

[Text] Vilnius, 14 April. (TASS)—A plenum of the provisional Central Committee of the Communist Party of Lithuania (on the CPSU platform) took place here today. The participants discussed the political report to the congress of the Communist Party of Lithuania (on the CPSU platform), and also a number of other issues connected with preparations for the party forum, which it is proposed to hold on 21 April.

### Prunskiene Addresses 11 Apr Supreme Council

*LD1404135390 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1458 GMT 11 Apr 90*

[Statement by Lithuanian Prime Minister Kazimiera Prunskiene at the Supreme Council session in Vilnius—live]

[Excerpts] Esteemed deputies, I would like to draw your attention to the fact that we should not devalue the concept of the government program. Today it is possible to speak only of the directions of the government's work and of urgent problems that should be solved. You understand very well that the last minister was appointed only a week ago. Therefore the government could not prepare its complete program. [passage omitted]

One may say that the formation of the government has been completed. [passage omitted]

Although one deputy chairman has not been appointed yet, we may still consider that the government has been formed and can work. In all, there are 17 ministers, five of whom worked in the previous government. The youngest minister is 28 years old, and the oldest is 65.

The average age of the ministers, if it is of interest to you, is 49 years. [passage omitted]

Compared with the composition of the former Council of Ministers, the present aparatus has been reduced by roughtly one- third. [passage omitted]

It is obvious that the politicians of the Western states are preparing to leave, and may leave us, to the discretion [nuoziura] of the Soviet Union and that the public opinion in those states will be reconciled with this. We know that a certain diplomatic blockade is taking place and that foreigners are being prevented from coming to Lithuania. Bearing in mind all these actions, actions to consolidate independence must be carried out in the direction of both the West and the East.

It is understandable that there would not be any obstacles to the state recognition in the West if the Soviet Union did not oppose it. The signs of goodwill that go into negotiations with us—disregarding the framework of the USSR constitution, which is mentioned so frequently,—so far are nonexistent. The government has to work to make dialogue with Moscow concrete and to direct it toward practical negotiations.

The latest correspondence with the Soviet Union has been somewhat more prospective. There have been mentions of mutual interest in starting negotiations, but stressing at the same time the framework of the USSR Constitution. Yesterday we drew up in a very concrete manner an appeal to the Soviet Union's Government to start negotiations and consultations by receiving a delegation of the Lithuanian government in Moscow. So far, we have not received any reply. [passage omitted]

Lithuania's economy, industry, and individual enterprises are fulfilling their obligations to the Soviet Union sufficiently well, and this is important at present. [passage omitted]

The most important thing for us is to prevent the introduction of presidential rule, to prevent reactionary forces from provoking processes that could become pseudo-arguments. [passage omitted]

### Prunskiene Views Baltic Cooperation Accord

*LD1404161990 Vilnius Domestic Service in Russian 1200 GMT 13 Apr 90*

[Lithuanian Premier Kazimiera Prunskiene interviewed by unidentified correspondent—recorded]

[Text] [Prunskiene] This is a form of cooperation between the three Baltic republics, Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia; which has been maturing for several years already, especialy recently. It was stepped up especially when we were jointly elaborating and defending our positions in Moscow, adopting the law on economic independence. In today's situation it is an expedient and practical benefit from our cooperation which is revealing itself more and more. We have adopted this document, which lays down specific forms of economic and cultural cooperation, and including not only the exchange of goods and joint enterprises, but also the joint elaboration and agreement of legislative acts, the elaboration of a common policy for entering the external market, and so on. In other words, it is a very wide range of matters, concluding with the fact that in the near future we will be creating a council, and in that council a commission for the Baltic market; and at the same time, we are organizing representations with each other. We have again laid down and recorded in the treaty the necessity of introducing national currencies. We also discussed the prospects (?in this matter) for a common currency. We do not envisage such a possibility in the immediate future, and did not write it into the treaty.

[Correspondent] Does this agreement concern purely economic relations?

[Prunskiene] Economic, but on a very broad plane, and I also find very many legal and political elements in it. First, there is actual direct economic cooperation, which will be shaped for us after many years, and the fact that we are finalizing common approaches, and the way we conduct it, what our policy looks like externally, to both the East and the West, and how we organize our markets, our common market; in this way we can (?fulfil our policy). The preparation took a very long time. That means the finalization of specific projects. For this, we have (?common) projects on individual points: cooperation in the fields of industry, the agricultural sphere, the trade sector, the areas of cultural exchange and tourism, and so on—very many specific documents, in other words. Work on finalizing those documents lasted a very long time: specific people working in these fields, representatives of all fields (word indistinct) Vilnius, Riga, Tallinn, Panevezys and other towns in our three republics, where they worked on those documents, not formally, but attempting to comprehend how this cooperation will proceed. Now, it is precisely these projects which will be implemented, because real possibilities have been reported.

The first step, say. We create our representations with each other and choose the people who will go to, say, Estonia. We already know initially who might be these representatives and how we will arrange their work, and then the council, the fact that it will be in Riga—that is practical fulfilment and implementation.

[Correspondent] Many will agree. Now, is a similar step envisaged in politics?

[Prunskiene] You know, we have a very large stock in political cooperation, just as we do in economics. I would say that, to date, real actions in the political sphere have been much more closely linked than in the economic field, because the economy went through Moscow, but we have already started to engage directly in politics from the start of the creation of the people's fronts and Sajudis, that's almost two years. Even before Sajudis existed, we were thinking about regional financial autonomy and economic independence, we went

through our political assembly, and so on. Our political actions and the acquisition of independence have existed from the very first stage when the real opportunity to implement that process appeared, and they are now taking on a more developed form. They are already linking up with the fact that we are moving over from opposition—each one of us, the People's Front and Sajudis—to positions in the state structure, and our relations on both the political and the economic plane are growing more mature, more solid and more like those between states.

### More on Economic Cooperation

*LD1404145490 Vilnius International Service in English 2130 GMT 13 Apr 90*

[Excerpt] As we have reported already, an economic cooperation treaty between Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia was signed in Vilnius yesterday [12 April]. For the first time, government leaders of the three Baltic states gathered at the highest level to discuss problems of common [word indistinct]. Following the talks, which lasted for about three hours, the premiers of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia signed a cooperation treaty and a communique. The documents will be published in the press within the next few days. The meeting of the Baltic states government leaders was held in the famous guest house of Vilnius, which was earlier reserved only for the rare visits of Moscow VIP's.

At a news conference Lithuania's Prime Minister Kasimieras Prunskiene pointed out that the treaty (?planned) the establishment of the Baltic market. That will be, as she puts it, the summit of our cooperation that will be achieved by developing economic, political, and cultural ties. On the other hand, at present, when the political status of the three republics is not uniform as yet, the signing of the treaty signifies, rather, political and moral support extended to one another. In future, which is most probably not far off, economic issues will no doubt dominate.

According to the Estonian Prime Minister Edgar Savisaar, the parties have pledged to fulfill the treaty regardless of the political status of the republics, that is, whether any of them remains in the Soviet Union or not.

The treaty is envisaged for the period up to the year 2000, that is, for a decade, and it will be implemented by specifying separate matters. The treaty envisages that the Baltic market will be established in two stages. The first will embrace the years 1990 and 1991, when the main laws and standard acts will be adopted and cooperation agreements in separate fields will be signed.

The second stage will embrace the period from 1992, when the market mechanism will be protected and annual agreements will be made (?up). The main trends of cooperation are legislation, financial policy, industry, construction, information, science, power engineering, transport, trade, culture and education, foreign economic relations, and other important spheres of management.

Planned for this year is the establishment of the Baltic republics' financial plan, as well as the Baltic Investment Bank, which will accumulate free capital, [word indistinct] from abroad, too, a marketing association of the Baltic market's information systems of commercial activity and trading legations will be set up.

Besides, the Lithuanian prime minister informed journalists that an exchange of diplomatic services between the three republics was also discussed during yesterday's talks.

Meanwhile, within three months time the Baltic Cooperation Council and its commission are to be set up. The council will include an equal number of representatives from each member-country of the Baltic market. The council's headquarters will be established in the Latvian capital Riga. The treaty will come into force when ratification documents are exchanged. That moment signifies the institution of the Baltic market [words indistinct] Soviet Union, one of its republics and foreign countries, which are interested in taking part in it, are mutually beneficial [word indistinct]. [passage omitted]

### Lithuanian Dissatisfaction With Sajudis Cited

*PM0504133190 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 5 Apr 90 Second Edition p 1*

[A. Solarev report under general heading "Separatists' Actions"]

[Text] **"We Will Create Such Chaos..."**

Vilnius—A rally attended by many thousands of people took place in a remote rayon of the city, Novo-Vilnyasskiy, 3 April. It had been organized by the rayon Committee of USSR Citizens in Lithuania and was held in support of President M.S. Gorbachev's Appeal to the Supreme Soviet deputies and citizens of the Lithuanian SSR. The rayon is a purely working class one. Two major machine-tool building plants, construction and decorating equipment associations, "Spalis," and other industrial enterprises determine its life. The local membership of the Lithuanian Communist Party (CPSU platform) currently totals some 1,500 people, according to V. Kazakov, first secretary of the rayon committee. Meanwhile the rayon organization of the independent Lithuanian Communist Party has only just over 200 members. The essence of almost all the speeches can be summed up as follows.

USSR President M.S. Gorbachev has once again appealed to our reason and responsibility during these difficult days for the republic and its people. In response we hear provocative statements by "Sajudis" figures claiming to be speaking on behalf of all Lithuania's people. The Sajudists are recreating a society of social inequality and disrupting economic, political, and social

ties between the country's peoples. Pursuing their own careerist aims, they are deliberately pushing the republic and its people toward a catastrophe and dooming the working people to unemployment, suffering, and privations.

In the evening of 4 April a city-wide rally was held in the square next to the building of the republic Supreme Soviet. At both these rallies the second issue of the revived newspaper SOVETSKAYA LITVA, which is published in three languages, was distributed. It still cannot be bought at "Soyuzpechat" [Main Administration for the Distribution of Printed Matter] kiosks. As the sales assistant at one of the kiosks put it: "We do not carry banned newspapers." Thus SOVETSKAYA LITVA still has to be distributed at enterprises and rallies. Nor has the question of printing it in Vilnius been resolved as yet. Despite the fact that the publishing house of the Lithuanian Communist Party, which has been transformed into the Lithuanian publishing house of the CPSU Central Committee, has been instructed to publish SOVETSKAYA LITVA instead of the Sajudis newspapers ATGIMIMAS, SOGLASIYE, RESPUBLIKA, and GIMTASIS KRASTAS which are currently being published there.

The formation of the government is nearing completion. As a rule, all ministerial posts are, with few exceptions, filled with "Sajudis" activists. I must mention that even some supporters of this organization are beginning to realize the pernicious nature of its activities. Vilnius University Professor B. Genzyalis could not have put it more bluntly: "We will organize such chaos that people will remember the past as bliss. It struck me for the first time today: Should I not resign from the 'Sajudis'? What kind of movement are we? I must frankly say that in a few years' time people will curse 'Sajudis'... We only think about our ambitions, and nothing else..."

## New Lithuanian Sajudis 'Rules' Published

*LD1404105490 Vilnius International Service in English 2130 GMT 13 Apr 90*

[Text] The Sajudis weekly ATGIMIMAS has published the new rules of the Lithuanian Restoration Movement Sajudis. That is the official new name of the grassroots movement which emerged as a movement in support of perestroyka. The rules will have to be approved by the Congress of Sajudis, which is due next weekend.

The Lithuanian Restoration Movement Sajudis is a name that discloses to the full the purpose and the main goals of the movement in this historical period, the goals being the restoration of the Lithuanian state, its citizens, its culture, and (?so on). The new name also defines well the greater aspect of the Sajudis activity, creation being the supreme form of activity.

The draft rules of Sajudis outline only its main functions, participation in the restoration of the Lithuanian state and educational activity. According to the authors of the draft, these concepts cover all the activity of Sajudis, therefore no details of concrete spheres of action are given in the draft, if a full list of such spheres can be made at all.

According to the draft rules of Sajudis, the movement is going to unite all the supporters of the restoration of the Lithuanian state irrespective of their nationality, (?face), or party affiliation. All the inhabitants of Lithuania will have good opportunities to freely choose the best individual way of contributing to the implementation of the Sajudis goal.

## Commentary on Lithuanian Impact on Western Ties

*LD1504125190 Moscow World Service in English 1110 GMT 15 Apr 90*

[Text] Can the Lithuanian problem have a negative effect on Moscow's dialogue with the West? Mikhail Mayorov writes the following comment:

The Lithuanian issue featured prominently on the agenda of talks that Soviet officials had with their Western counterparts over the past few days. There were no outbreaks of confrontation either during Eduard Shevardnadze's talks in Washington or in the course of the British Foreign Secretary, Douglas Hurd's visit to Moscow. On the whole, the West displayed restraint and avoided interference in the Soviet Union's internal affairs. President Bush on Wednesday, 11 April, informed that Washington is not going to recognize Lithuania diplomatically. He said so as he received American citizens of Baltic descent. Moscow has welcomed the cautious attitude taken by Europe and the United States.

Some observers have attributed the position taken by the West to a time-serving diplomacy of smiles prompted by the desire to avoid causing harm to President Gorbachev. That such considerations are taken into account is not ruled out. But why should not one agree that we are beginning to think in a new way and brushing aside the methods and tactics of the past? The situation in Lithuania formualted a stark question: Won't we yield to the temptation of using power politics and thereby returning to the past? Jeane Kirkpatrick says in an article in the WASHINGTON POST that Mr. Gorbachev's greatest merit is that he kept the army in the barracks at a time when fundamental change began to take place in Eastern Europe. Isn't this also an answer to the question: How serious is the risk of resorting to military means in handling the problem? What kind of conclusions the West has made is seen not only in its reserved attitude to the Lithuanian issue. In Moscow, Washington and London preparations are in full swing for Soviet-American and Soviet-British summit meetings due in May and June, which is another rather telling indication.

### Daily Warns Lithuania of Economic Problems

*LD1404092190 Moscow TASS in English 0900 GMT 14 Apr 90*

[Text] Moscow April 14 TASS—The illusion that Lithuania's economic contacts with the Soviet Union, after the rupture of political ties between them, will be maintained on the same terms is being insistently cultivated in the Baltic republic, the Moscow-based newspaper SELSKAYA ZHIZN says today.

"Only very naive people—and there are no such in present politicised Lithuania—can seriously hope that 'another state,' which has quite a few problems of its own, will continue its gratis powerful financial injection into the republic's economy.

"One should be aware that, if the Lithuanian parliament continues to abide by its current policy, transition to mutual payments at world prices and in hard currency will be inevitable.

"This means that one tonne of oil will cost not R30 but 110-120 dollars, one cubic meter of gas will cost not R26 but 62 dollars, and one tonne of diesel fuel will cost not R68 but 130 dollars.

"On the other hand, the prices of Lithuania's exports—meat, milk, fish, knitwear and other light industry products—on the Soviet market are so far higher than on the world market. According to economists' estimates, Lithuania's unfavourable balance would exceed 3.5 billion foreign currency rubles.

"However, in the republican parliament and newspapers these statistics are 'killed' by one argument: 'The centre wants to intimidate Lithuanians and to bring them to their knees.'

"Lithuania hopes to solve its problems in the course of future negotiations with the Soviet leadership and is waiting impatiently for their beginning.

"Of course, dialogue is possible. Moreover, it is necessary. In the long run, it would be even unnatural if the peoples, which have lived in one family side by side for half a century, were unable to discuss their problems in a calm and well-balanced way.

"The question is whether the Lithuanian parliament in this difficult situation can make a step that will enhance its prestige, namely admit that the proclamation of Lithuania's independence forestalled the natural course of present political processes," SELSKAYA ZHIZN concludes.

### Lithuanian Deputies Meet U.S. Senators

*LD1404180190 Vilnius Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 14 Apr 90*

[Text] A group of Lithuanian parliamentarians visited Moscow yesterday. Here is a converation we had over the telephone with one member of the group, Bronislovas Kuzmickas, a deputy in the Lithuanian Supreme Council:

[Begin Kuzmickas recording] The purpose of our trip to Moscow was to meet a group of U.S. senators who are visiting the Soviet Union. We regard such meetings as very useful, both for Lithuania and, I feel, for the general political situation now developing, the tense situation between Lithuania and the Soviet Union. This is because the senators are well informed about the U.S position on this question. They also had an opportunity to hear the Soviet Government's standpoint. They met us in order to hear our point of view too, and to try and find some way of solving the problem. Therefore, I consider that the meeting was useful both from the republic's point of view and from the point of view of resolving the [word indistinct] situation which is developing [words indistinct] [end recording]

### 'Absurd' Theory Behind Soviet Policies Noted

*LD1404105290 Vilnius International Service in English 2130 GMT 13 Apr 90*

[From the press review]

[Text] Lithuania marks the anniversary of last year's tragic events in Tbilisi. Newspapers publish a lot of photos and reports from the Georgian capital. All journalists point out similarities in national liberation movements.

As soon as there is at least a hint of secession from the Soviet Union, the USSR squashes this drive cruelly. A year after the Tbilisi tragedy, Soviet armored vehicles are parading in the streets of Vilnius, while talk on presidential rule in Lithuania is getting louder and louder in Moscow. The Soviet capital is sinking back into Stalinist dogmas, while Gorbachev continues his seance of hypnosis with the Western world, and it's the West, not the Soviet Union that is now most concerned about the success of perestroyka.

The blatant lies that Moscow-based TV and newspapers are spreading about Lithuania cannot leave Lithuanian journalists inert. From time to time, one or another newspaper carries a commentary on a disclosed falsification, or the Lithuanian journalists try to talk with their Soviet colleagues in an attempt to appeal to their reason and conscience. The 50-year-long forcible test of the absurd Stalinist theory in Lithuania has come to a logical end, writes the daily RESPUBLIKA, yet the theory of the absurd still exists, and it lies at the foundation of the Soviet Union's policies toward Lithuania.

### Lithuanian Territorial Claims Viewed

*90UN1298A Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Mar 90 Second Edition p 2*

[Article by A. Gorbatov: "Big Plans for 'Little Lithuania'"]

[Text] **"I heard in one of the All-Union Radio broadcasts that a social movement had been created or, in any case, that there was a group of people who consider Kaliningrad Oblast 'Little Lithuania,' and that they have made territorial claims on that basis against the neighboring republic—the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic]. Are they really serious?**

[Signed] "O. Volskaya, Kharkov"

Yes, our reader is right. The idea of "Little Lithuania," which is supposedly located on the territory of Kaliningrad Oblast, and other claims for an "ethnic homeland for Lithuanians" in the republic may be heard more and more frequently today. And so that I am not making unsubstantiated statements, I will acquaint the readers of PRAVDA with one of the recent articles from the weekly RESPUBLIKA which is put out by "Sajudis."

Zh. Simanavichyus called his article, "Could There Be a Corridor to the Baltic Sea?" Beginning with a discussion about the current rise in temperature in the political climate, the author immediately moves on to a thought about the possibility of concluding a treaty between the USSR (or the RSFSR), Lithuania, and Poland transferring all the ports on the Baltic Sea to the Baltic republics. In this context Zh. Simanavichyus suggests that the transit of some USSR goods be conducted by railway through the ports of the Baltic countries for commercial fees, as is done elsewhere in the world.

Then the author hastily expresses a bold plan whereby the RSFSR currently has its Leningrad port on the Baltic Sea, but of course that is not enough for it and therefore it should be permitted to build one more port in... the present Kaliningrad Oblast, in the most southwestern part—with an exit onto the Baltic Sea across the Bay of Gdansk. A narrow zone, along which Russia could continue a highway and a railway for communication with its port, could be marked off east of that port to Belorussia along the border of Kaliningrad Oblast and Poland.

"At its beginning, the corridor from the port would run along the southern districts of Kaliningrad Oblast. Here the specified zone of land might even be given to Poland. In order for the corridor to avoid the sharp corner at the border of Lithuania before Galdupe, it will have to turn to the southeast and cut off the Suvalki, Augustav, and other ethnic Lithuanian territories from Poland and exit at the border of Belorussia southwest of Grodno where the railway and highway from Moscow to Poland via Minsk already runs.

"In this fashion it might be possible to right a still-recent wrong: To acknowledge in the United Nations that the Suvalki, Augustav, and perhaps part of the Baltstog territories, seized by the Poles after World War I, belong to Lithuania. For the return of the lands that it seized, Poland might even receive compensation—the aforementioned piece of territory on the southern portion of Kaliningrad Oblast once the corridor is moved a little more north from the current Polish border in the appropriate places.

"Kaliningrad Oblast must not remain a colony of the RSFSR because colonial times are already over. This ethnic land of the Prussians has the right to share the heritage solely of the brothers of that same family—the Lithuanians.

"Belorussia and the Ukraine could also exit independently on the Baltic Sea by a common corridor or by one that is broadened and shared lengthwise (with a second highway and railway).

"Lithuania's initiative on opening a direct route to the Baltic Sea not only for Russia but also for Belorussia and the Ukraine may interest the latter two and guarantee their support of this project. It would strengthen still more the friendship of the peoples and would help resolve one more problem—the restoration of the fair ethnic and state border between Lithuania and Belorussia that was determined and confirmed by Lenin's signature on Lithuania's 12 July 1920 peace treaty with Russia."

The author's journey from the depths of the Middle Ages directly to the 21st century is so swift and so unexpected that only a specialist who knows the subject could examine such logic. For this reason our correspondent asked E. Fedosov, lead scientific associate at the USSR Institute of History of the USSR Academy of Sciences and doctor of historical sciences, and S. Myakushev, senior scientific associate and candidate of historical sciences, to comment on the article from the Lithuanian newspaper RESPUBLIKA.

"Without even going into an evaluation of the political and economic sense of the proposal of Zh. Simanavichyus to create in Kaliningrad Oblast a special port for Russia, the Ukraine, and Belorussia, one should first of all point to the author's complete disregard of the contemporary economic situation in the Baltic ports and transport arteries."

And of what value are the historical and ethnic claims of Zh. Simanavichyus? But before proceeding to discuss them, it is important in our opinion to remind readers about the formation of the present territory of the Lithuanian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic].

A bourgeois state arose in Lithuania in the period after the October Revolution while Lithuanian land was occupied by German troops. There was no opportunity then to talk about firm state borders. The question of the eastern and southern regions was extremely delicate because of the very tense relations with the Polish state. Proclamation of the Lithuanian-Belorussian SSR did not change the situation inasmuch as on 21 April 1919 the capital of the republic—Vilnius—was seized by Polish legionnaires, and attempts by the Red Army to return the

lost territory were not successful. Nor could the Lithuanian bourgeois government do anything. In 1920 Soviet-Lithuanian peace negotiations began, and they ended with the 12 July signing of a treaty between the RSFSR (but not Belorussia) and the Lithuanian Democratic Republic. The treaty was not signed by Lenin but by A. Ioffe, Yu. Markhlevskiy, and L. Obolenskiy.

This treaty defined the Soviet-Lithuanian border in a most radical manner inasmuch as Molodechno, Oshmyany, Lida, and Grodno were included in Lithuania. The Vilenskiy region was also transferred to the Lithuania state. The treaty was prepared and signed as the Red Army was driving the White Poles to the west, and the Lithuanian party noted at the signing that it would not have any claims on the Red Army if the latter were to remain on Lithuanian territory. And that is the way it happened. On 14 July the III Cavalry Corps of G. Gay occupied Vilnius.

But there was a turning point in favor of Poland in the course of the Soviet-Polish war. When the Soviet forces retreated, the White Poles again occupied the Vilenskiy region in October 1920. The signing of the Riga treaty with Poland on 12 October 1920 left the resolution of disputed territorial issues under the jurisdiction of Poland and Lithuania.

An accord in 1919 proclaimed the transfer of Vilnius to Lithuania. There was hardly any direct connection between these decisions, but in 1923 Memel Oblast, which was under French administration (it had earlier been part of Germany), was transferred to Lithuania. Memel was renamed Klaipeda.

In March 1939 Hitler forced the Smetona regime to return the Klaipeda region to Germany. The territory of the republic again shrank to its 1920 dimensions. And then the stormy events of August-September 1939 changed the situation substantially. After the signing of the Soviet-German documents in August 1939 and the Wehrmacht's invasion of Poland, the Red Army occupied those eastern regions of Poland that had a predominantly Belorussian and Ukrainian population. The USSR also signed a treaty with Lithuania on 10 October 1939. Lithuania received the Vilenskiy region as well as the Red Army garrisons (which should not be forgotten), but new borders were established that did not include the strip from Grodno to Molodechno.

On 3 August 1940, the day the Lithuanian SSR was accepted into the USSR, its territory was supplemented with Svyantsyanskiy Rayon and parts of Bidzovskiy, Godutishkovskiy, Ostrovetskiy, Voronovskiy, and Radunskiy rayons of Baranovichskiy and Vileyskiy oblasts of the Belorussian SSR, where a Lithuanian population predominated. The current attitude in Lithuania toward the 1939 Soviet-German documents and toward the 3 August 1940 USSR Law are well known. But acknowledgment that these documents are invalid objectively leads to a renunciation of the territories that were acquired in accordance with them.

The borders of the Lithuanian SSR received their final form after the Great Patriotic War, when Klaipeda Oblast was included.

As for the ethnic history of Eastern Europe, it is a chain of tragic disappearances of whole nationalities, their assimilation and absorption, and the displacement of some nationalities by others. For instance, the Prussians demonstrated heroic resistance to German aggression, which was carried out by the Teutonic Order. They repeatedly revolted against their conquerors and were to a significant degree destroyed, and their lands were taken over by migrants from the German principalities. Those who survived were almost completely assimilated and accepted the German language and culture. By 1945 there was practically no population left in Eastern Prussia, which had been devastated by war.

With all certainty it must be said that the Lithuanian state is secondary in relation to many of the populated areas mentioned in the article. Yes, as the Principality of Greater Lithuania expanded it took into its borders extensive lands with hardly any Lithuanian population. But all these borders ceased to exist 500 years ago. Moreover, the districts around the cities of Suvalki, Avgustov, and Belostok were never part of the Lithuanian state even at its greatest extent.

However, by making claims on land that was previously part of the Principality of Greater Lithuania or is settled by its peoples, the author assiduously uses the Lithuanian names of the cities. It is known that in the time of Tsar Aleksey Mikhaylovich the Russians called Stockholm Stekolnyy, which still did not make it a Russian city. Can we hope for any better result by calling Konigsberg Karalyauchyus?

On the whole, following the logic of the author of the article and of those who hold similar views, one might not only redraw the borders of the USSR union republics but also revise the eastern borders of Poland. One might even revise the results of World War II. Such an attitude will hardly inspire the United Nations, upon whom the author lays such great hope.

## Lithuanian Soldier Urges Against Desertion

*PM0504085790 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 4 Apr 90 First Edition p 1*

[Special correspondent A. Solarev report under the general heading "Situation in Lithuania": "I Will Not Desert"]

[Text] Of late cases of desertion from Soviet Army ranks have become more frequent among Lithuanian soldiers. This was promoted to a considerable extent, of course, by the inflammatory actions on the part of Lithuanian Supreme Soviet deputies, who adopted the resolution on the nonvalidity on Lithuanian territory of the USSR Law on Military Service, and local press articles which effectively encouraged soldiers to leave their place of military

service. It was stated outright in parliament that the republic would take them under its wing.

But do all Lithuanian soldiers believe that? This is what Senior Sergeant Algis Vileyta, deputy platoon commander, said on this subject:

When I went to the Shyaulyay Military Commissariat during my leave to register, the female attendant said to me: "If you were my son I would not let you serve any longer." Then she began to encourage me to desert, citing the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet resolution. I wanted to say a few choice words to her, but of course I restrained myself. She was a woman after all. I marked my leave document, turned, and left. Now, when I read the newspapers, I see how many lives this decision has already ruined. It turns out that about a thousand of my fellow citizens have deserted. What are you doing, guys! Think about it!

No, it is not solicitude for us soldiers that motivates the people calling for desertion. They want to make us young people pawns, puppets in their political game. They want to realize their selfish, power-hungry aspirations at the expense of fledgling soldiers' hearts. Yet they hide behind the trumpery of fine words: They say that it is unworthy of a Lithuanian patriot to serve in an army of occupation. How can it be an army of occupation if it is our native Soviet Army! It was this Army, not anyone else, that liberated my Shyaulyay from the fascists!

By my calculations there are now approximately 30,000 of us Lithuanians in the service. Even if a thousand are deserters—I ask your forgiveness, guys, but that's what I call you; after all, facts are facts. I am sorry for you. You have been deceived. But I want to say to those who are still serving: Don't succumb to provocation, if you value the honor of your native land. Remember its history: Lithuanians have always been excellent soldiers. Let us carry on being that. Traditions compel us to do so.

## Defense Ministry on Baltic 'Anti-Army' Acts

*PM2903093790 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 29 Mar 90 Second Edition p 1*

[USSR Defense Ministry Press Center report under the general heading "Situation in Lithuania": "Who Is Sowing the Seeds of Discord"]

[Text] Two sixth-graders were attacked by four young people in the city of Prenay, Lithuanian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] near the old cemetery. Both were beaten up and one had his pioneer tie ripped off. The victims are the children of servicemen.

This event may not seem that significant to some people against the backdrop of current events in the Baltic republics. All the same... A red tie is torn off a pioneer, monuments to soldier liberators are being dismantled, and then a memorial stela is set up in honor of the men of the SS.

Such cases have rightly been seen as a result of the anti-Army campaign being mounted within the region, during which disinformation and slanderous statements are being widely used. Thus, in his speech on republic television, D. Ivans, one of the leaders of the Latvian People's Front, claimed without proof that Soviet Army servicemen are forcibly disarming the Lithuanian militia. Ivans asserts that in response to this the Latvian People's Front must recruit and send volunteers to Lithuania from among the republic's militia personnel. It is easy to imagine the possible consequences of such provocative statements.

The republic's Supreme Soviet has urged deserters who have gone AWOL from Soviet Army units to seek refuge in churches, closed medical establishments, and other places that are difficult to inspect. Approximately 250 Lithuanian soldiers have officially been registered as AWOL. The Army command is taking steps to ensure they return to their units. Regrettably, local law-enforcement bodies, as has already been reported, are not only not helping but are sometimes even impeding this process.

Sajudis organizations are still enrolling volunteers for "home guard" subunits. According to a statement made by Z. Vayshvila, Lithuanian "defense minister," the future "Lithuanian Army" should number 38,500 people. A military group of reserve officers is operating under Sajudis, formed from officers from the former 16th Lithuanian Division. They aim among other things to spread the traditions of the old Lithuanian Army, work with young men before the draft, and set up national formations.

Under these conditions it is becoming a matter of honor for all true patriotic, internationalist forces to oppose the instigators and firebrands who are thirsting to satisfy their own ends.

## Shved Addresses Vilnius Press Conference

*PM1204111590 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 12 Apr 90 p 3*

[TASS correspondent V. Kostrov report: "On Separatists' Unscrupulous Methods"]

[Text] Tension is unfortunately intensifying in Lithuania and the constitutional crisis is deepening, caused by the unjustified and illegal actions of the Lithuanian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet, which is openly embarking on confrontation with the Soviet Union and the USSR Constitution. This idea was heard at a press conference organized in Vilnius by the interdepartmental press center of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs, the USSR KGB, the USSR Defense Ministry, the Lithuanian Communist Party (on the CPSU platform), and the Committee of USSR Citizens in Lithuania. It was voiced by V. Shved, second secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party's provisional Central Committee, addressing Soviet and foreign journalists.

Uncertainty for the future is mounting among the republic's population, he stressed. That applies particularly to the supporters of the Soviet Federation since the measures taken by the USSR president and Government with regard to the Lithuanian parliament are not firm or consistent enough. Take just the following example. In his appeal the country's president, M.S. Gorbachev, suggests that the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet immediately repeal at a session the illegal acts it has adopted yet the republic's Supreme Soviet is simultaneously continuing to issue new acts. Each more trenchant than the last. I shall dwell on just one of the most recent—on the law "on the certification of the citizen of the Lithuanian republic" which clearly states: "People who receive certification as a citizen of the Lithuanian republic sign the following undertakings: 'I (surname and first name), upon receiving certification as a citizen of the Lithuanian republic, undertake to observe the laws of the Lithuanian republic and to respect the independence of my state and its territorial integrity.'"

You ask what a man thinks on acquainting himself with this law. Naturally, he is faced with a choice: How can he continue to live and what should he do? Because he knows full well what awaits him if he does not sign this undertaking. What awaits him, as the Lithuanian government has already stated, is as follows: "The government urges the inhabitants of Lithuania not to take part in actions aimed against the resolutions of the Lithuanian republic Supreme Soviet and government decisions. People who disagree with them will place themselves outside the framework of Lithuanian civilian society and will no longer be protected from adverse legal, economic, and social consequences."

Inasmuch as there has been no prompt reaction from the USSR to these statements and laws of the republic's Supreme Soviet, the citizens of Lithuania are beginning to waver, which is ultimately leading many of them to apathy and indifference or to a certain extremism, the Lithuanian Communist Party second secretary noted.

In addition, the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet is making attempts to set some national groups of the republic's population against others. In particular the Poles against the Russians. This was clearly manifested in the decision of the republic's parliament to halt Leningrad television broadcasts and to begin to receive a Polish channel. The Polish channel, of course, is needed and even essential. But why close down the television transmission from Leningrad? Many Belorussians also live in our republic. They would also be pleased to view the Belorussian television channel. But the republic's Supreme Soviet has its own aims on this score.

Who in the republic stands to gain right now from embarking on confrontation with the Soviet Union? V. Shved asked in conclusion, and said: The answer is simple—it is to the advantage of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet which, against the background of a common "enemy," primarily in the shape of Moscow, is trying to rally the Lithuanian people and persuade them of the correctness and necessity of its decisions and impose on them the idea of universal welfare and prosperity if Lithuania leaves the Soviet Union. But this design of the political leaders, like their unscrupulous methods, could lead the whole republic into an impasse. And that is dangerous.

### Voronezh Communists Appeal to Lithuanians

*PM0504102390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Apr 90 First Edition p 1*

[Report by correspondent V. Stepnov under the general heading: "Do Not Break Living Threads"]

[Text] Voronezh—At a routine Voronezh CPSU Gorkom [city committee] plenum an appeal was adopted to the communists and all citizens of the Lithuanian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic]. It has been sent to the USSR President and is addressed to the CPSU Central Committee and the Central Committee of the Lithuanian Communist Party on the CPSU platform.

The appeal says: The communists and all inhabitants of Voronezh City are following with alarm the political processes taking place in the Lithuanian SSR.

The Lithuanian Supreme Soviet has adopted illegal legislative acts aimed at destroying the republic's historically formed ties with the Union. The fates of hundreds of thousands of people living in the republic have been frivolously put at risk. We believe that the separatist actions of the present Lithuanian leadership fail to consider the opinion and interests of all citizens of the Lithuanian and non-Lithuanian nationalities and do not resolve all problems but on the contrary aggravate them.

We unconditionally support the right of every nation to self determination, but we express the firm conviction that a mechanism for its practical implementation should be created which would ensure the implementation of the legitimate interests of all national groups and of each person.

On behalf of the participants in the party gorkom plenum we state our solidarity with all progressive forces of the Lithuanian SSR and we support the activity of the communists who stand on the CPSU platform and are seeking the prosperity of Soviet Lithuania within a renewed federation of equal Soviet peoples.

We firmly believe and hope that, relying on the support of the entire Soviet people, you will be able to pool your efforts and ensure the defense of the rights and interests of Soviet citizens of all nationalities.

### Afanasyev, Marashev Write on Vilnius Visit

*LD1304125290 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1000 GMT 13 Apr 90*

[Text] USSR Deputies Yuriy Afanasyev and Arkadiy Murashev have sent a message to Anatoliy Lukyanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

The messages says: on 7-8 April of this year, we visited Vilnius at the invitation of the Lithuanian Supreme Council. We think that we definitely have to inform you and the USSR Supreme Soviet about our impressions of Vilnius and to share our thoughts.

Staying in Vilnius, we took part in the Sajudis meeting on 7 April, witnessed the events of 8 April at the House of the Press, met and conversed with the chairman of the Supreme Council of the Republic of Lithuania, with Vytautas Landsbergis and other deputies, and met and conversed with Lithuanians and people of other nationalities.

On the whole, the situation in Lithuania is calm, but people we met expressed their concern and anxiety. The sources of anxiety are different for Lithuanians and non-Lithuanians. The Lithuanians are concerned about possible use of military force. Non-Lithuanians are afraid of becoming second-class people in independent Lithuania, but all Russians with whom we conversed acknowledge the right of secession by the Lithuanian nation, and many of them support this right. Nobody doubts that the resolutions of the Supreme Council of Lithuania are supported by the majority of the inhabitants.

In our opinion, the main cause of the tension is that so far negotiations between Lithuania and the Soviet Union have not started. The intonation of the adopted official documents concerning Lithuania, which are contradictory, insult Lithuanians national feelings, and provokes their intolerance toward Russians, making them hostages in the effusion of the national wrong.

As we understand, the reasons for disagreement are as follows:

The attitude of the Soviet leadership is that Lithuania is a part of the Soviet Union and the decisions of the Lithuanian Government must not contradict the USSR Constitution. The attitude of the Lithuanian leadership is that Lithuania never belonged to the Soviet Union, and was a territory occupied by the Soviet Union where, in spite of this, free elections have taken place followed by the restoration of statehood which was interrupted by occupation. Both these views are defended by corresponding arguments.

Adhering to the principle that nobody can have the monopoly of justice, we think these contradictions must become the object of negotiations, which should start as soon as possible. The very fact of starting negotiations would become a powerful impulse to reduce tension in Lithuania and improve the moral climate in relations with non-Lithuanians.

### Brazauskas Interviewed on Baltic Role

*LD1304183690 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1300 GMT 13 Apr 90*

[Interview with Algirdas Brazauskas, deputy chairman of the Lithuanian Council of Ministers and first secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee, by Benas Repeika; place not given, on 13 April—live or recorded]

[Excerpts] [passage omitted]

[Rupeika] I think that yesterday's meeting with the heads of governments of the Baltic states is your concern.

[Brazauskas] Partly it is my concern. There was an economic agreement, an agreement on economic cooperation. [passage omitted] This agreement was signed by the prime ministers of all three Baltic republics. This is a very important act. It provides for many spheres of cooperation. I am very interested in the development of production forces and the disclosure of various enterprises and power stations.

[Rupeika] What is the weight of this economic agreement, which may be the beginning of an economic federation, in our present economic life? Is it a symbol which has a future or the other way around?

[Brazauskas] I would describe it as a step which has a future. Ties, which have lasted for decades, remain; they are not very extensive. One of the reasons is that the structure of industrial production in all three republics is very similar. If it were different we could specialize better. This would be better for us. But I think that in the future, as we carry out the policy of rationalizing our structure, of economic structure, we will be taking into consideration this agreement and all principles contained in this agreement. And we will be guided by it.

[Rupeika] Maybe we could speak now about the first month of independent Lithuania?

[Brazauskas] It has passed very quickly. There were many events. We must only regret that there have been no steps leading to an agreement, the recognition of the act of the restoration of our independence. I hope that the following month will be more significant in this respect. I think that in the future our steps must be more resolute. The same applies to Moscow. I cannot imagine how long this period of the unknown can last, this period of tension. The republic's leadership and people are hoping and waiting. I cannot say that we do nothing; we all work, the workers in the factories, agricultural workers too. Our spiritual and moral situation is not as it should be. These matters should be solved sooner.

[Rupeika] I forced you to talk about very important matters, but I would like to ask whether the independent Lituanian Communist Party will express its attitude to the present political situation, both internal and foreign policy aspects, because it is urged to do this not only by the party members but also by other people.

[Brazauskas] I cannot agree that we do not say anything. The Lithuanian Communist Party, advancing with the whole nation along the path of independences, has been proposing and will do so in the future that these negotiations, widely discussed by people, should be genuine negotiations. I think that we all should unite and look for

ways out of this state of affairs. One should listen to various opinions, not only of those of the Lithuanian Communist Party; one should listen to the opinions of other groups of people and search for the ways out. If the Lithuanian Supreme Council adheres to such firm positions, then what is the result? I think that both sides should reach a compromise. Politicians cannot be without them. [passage indistinct] We must look for solutions. We must look for which measures should be taken, which steps should be made to move this.

[Rupeika] What will be the step of the Lithuanian Communist Party, which is probably the best organized party in the republic?

[Brazauskas] I would not call it a step, it should be called the description of attitude, the form of proposal, the form of goodwill proposals. And these rumors in Lithuania that a second staff is sought which could duplicate the official Lithuanian leadership are without foundations. Neither Lithuanian people nor foreigners should pay attention to them. These are only suppositions. [passage omitted] We must not even think about it. If we now think and look at each other as some future member of a new personnel, what will happen? We will lose confidence in people. Where is the unity, where is consolidation, coalition? I think we should divert all our wisdom and energy to look for solutions on how to start those negotiations and what we ourselves should do for this purpose.

[Rupeika] Some people think that they wait for the Gorbachev-Bush meeting, that Moscow waits, keeping Lithuania in this state, and then they will take more resolute solutions.

[Brazauskas] These are suppositions. I think there are other opportunities for agreements. There is no need to wait for a summit agreement; furthermore, because the Soviet Union maintains constant relations with the United States. Of course, we know nothing about all these results, but one has an impression that the United States very mildly in its opinion about its possible reaction to relations between the Soviet Union and Lithuania say very carefully that this can only delay the process of this cooperation or the problems of disarmament, may delay it. [sentence as received] This treatment, it seems to me, is more than mild.

[Rupeika] You must be aware that these, your words, will be repeated by foreign news agencies and they will hear you there. Shevardnadze and Baker [words indistinct] may make the cooperation with Moscow worse.

[Brazauskas] Of course, it is better to leave these lofty politics alone. I do not draw any conclusions, I only state the facts. These are the facts.

[Rupeika] You are now almost a private person in politics and have the right to look at everything in a more critical manner.

[Brazauskas] I can look more critically, but I am not a private person, I am a member of the government, deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers, and I cannot speak as freely as someone else. [passage omitted]

## Women's Delegation Recounts Meetings in Moscow

*LD1304160890 Vilnius Domestic Service in Russian 1200 GMT 13 Apr 90*

[Excerpts] Representatives of a delegation of women from Lithuania, journalist Lyubov Chernaya and Ignalina nuclear power station worker Margarita Zuyeva share their impressions of a trip to Moscow:

[Unidentified female speaker] While it is not possible for official representatives to reach agreement in Moscow, as they do not wish to enter into negotiations with Lithuania, with the Lithuanian Republic, women decided to tackle the task, as this [words indistinct] popular diplomacy, of which Gorbachev was once a supporter. On 9 April 12 women from Vilnius set off for Moscow. They included representatives of various women's organizations. [passage omitted]

At the CPSU Central Committee we were received by Girenko, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, who is in charge of inter-ethnic issues. In this conversation he noted, or rather, this formualtion was heard for the first time—at least, it was the first time that I had heard it—it is now a matter not of annulling the act of independence, but of suspending its validity for a certain period, in order for secession from the USSR to become a process, not an action. Well, that sounds fairly hopeful. It can be perceived as an invitation to some sort of dialogue, although there were, of course, accusations aimed at us, and there was a lack of understanding. But that was as usual—we have already grown accustomed to it and don't notice it.

Besides that, there was a meeting at the general staff, attended by lieutenants-general and chiefs of directorates, various directorates. It was conducted by Lieutenant General Markovskiy. All, or almost all, of those generals have been in Vilnius. They have been very well informed about everything, although, of course, their views, in general, did not differ from the official views, but one can note several positive points. We dealt mainly, of course, with the boys, the conscripts, those who were taken from the Naujoji Vilnia hospital and those who have left their military units. Well, what positive things can I note? First, they said that those 12 boys from the hospital are in Anadyr, which we know from telegrams, and the senior commanders of their units will grant their parents the opportunity to meet them, although Anadyr is a sort of forbidden zone; but, all the same, there is hope that it will be possible to obtain some kind of permits—in any event, we recorded the general's words on tape—and efforts will be made to do this. [passage omitted]

Of course, we planned to meet Gorbachev and Yazov there. We realized that it was unrealistic, but we sent

them letters. Girenko said that the letter would be put into Gorbachev's hands personally. We sent a letter to Yazov. A letter was presented at the U.S. embassy for Mrs. Bush, and they also assured us that it would be handed over. We hoped to meet Raisa Maksimovna [Gorbacheva] at the Culture Fund, but she was not there at that moment. We left her a note; it is possible that this meeting will take place. [passage omitted]

### Hunting Gun Ammunition Seized in Klaipeda

*LD1304155790 Moscow TASS in English 1542 GMT 13 Apr 90*

[By TASS correspondent Aleksandr Borisov]

[Text] Moscow April 13 TASS—The customs officers of the Lithuanian port Klaipeda detained a container of hunting-gun ammunition that arrived from Hamburg on April 12.

The cargo was detained in accordance with the Soviet president's decree on March 21, 1990, a spokesman at the Main State Customs Control Department under the USSR Council of Ministers told TASS.

The decree envisages a temporary procedure to acquire and safeguard firearms and ammunition on Lithuanian territory.

According to the department, the container that arrived from Hamburg on board the Soviet motorship Marat Kozlov held 240,000 hunting-gun cartridges of various calibers with an aggregate weight of more than 10 tonnes.

The contents are estimated at 240,000 West German Marks. The cargo was intended for the Lithuanian Foreign Trade Association Litimpex.

### 'Mayak' Official on Broadcasts in Lithuanian

*LD1204154290 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1100 GMT 11 Apr 90*

[Excerpt] Why is the [Moscow] radio station Mayak braodcasting in Lithuanian? Journalist Vasiliy (Bogomolnikov) has spoken on the telephone with Aleksandr (Atyshkin), main director of the management of the All-Union Radio programs.

[Begin recording] [(Bogomolnikov)] Aleksandr Ivanovich, we would like to obtain some information from you: You know that on Sunday [day only as heard] we had occasion to listen to a program on the Mayak wavelength. As far as I can understand, it was relayed from Moscow, in Russian, and a translation was made here into Lithuanian.

[(Aytyshkin)] That's right.

[(Bogomolnikov)]Tell me, what kind of program is it; with what purpose is it made?

[(Atyshkin)] There was this decision, resolution, by the Council of Ministers, an instruction, for our All-Union Radio, at Gostelradio, to create an editorial office which would prepare material from Moscow in the languages of the union republics. As for the purpose, well, it's to some extent to make central radio broadcasting all-union, not only in terms of being all-union, but also putting all these materials in the national languages. There have been requests for this on more than one occasion, and now, from time to time, within our resources, we will be preparing such programs. In the case in question, regarding what we are talking about, in the Lithuanian language. Such half-hour programs will be broadcast periodically on the Mayak frequency. That was at 1400 on Sunday—that's 1300 where you are. I believe that at 1300 next Sunday we will be broadcasting another program.

[(Bogomolnikov)] And a translation will be made into Lithuanian?

[(Atyshkin]) Yes. In general we would like information about all these events and matters, acute and very sensitive, delicate matters, say, connected with Lithuania, also to be covered from Moscow; in the main, of course, on the basis of official material, but material which could be of interest to the population.

[(Bogomolnikov)] Aleksandr Ivanovich, have you had any first responses from the inhabitants of Lithuania?

[(Atyshkin)] I can't say anything for the moment, it's only Wednesday morning; even a letter, unfortunately, takes three or four days to get here, so we don't have any responses as yet.

[(Bogomolnikov)] We get calls here at the editorial office from people, in the main, you know, people of Lithuanian nationality; they say that the programs aren't very objective, and so on, and so forth.

[(Atyshkin)] As regards what is objective, you understand, when everyone has expressed an opinion, and there is then an analysis and the average opinion is elicited, it will already be closer to an objective opinion. As you know, there is no such thing as objectivity or absolute truth in general. So who can say that the Lithuanian comrades have an objective opinion; they all have various opinions. If there are any factual errors, factual inaccuracies, we are, of course, ready to discuss this and punish the people who are providing factual inaccuracies. [passage omitted] [end recording]

### Landsbergis on Initial Lithuanian Crisis

*PM2703151690 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 12, 25 Mar 90 p 5*

[Interview with Lithuanian Supreme Soviet Chairman Vytautas Landsbergis by Vladimir Kyucharyants: "Vytautas Landsbergis: "Problems Between Lithuania And the USSR Should Be Solved Politically"]

[Text] [Kyucharyants] Mr. Chairman, the message addressed to you from Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev specified that your reply should be given in three days. What do you think?

[Landsbergis] This deadline was imposed so that my reply would be ready by the opening of the next USSR Supreme Soviet session.

[Kyucharyants] Lithuania has unilaterally declared that all all-Union-level enterprises on its territory are now under the Lithuania's jurisdiction although they will continue to work under their former contracts. But these enterprises are owned by the Soviet state and all the republics have invested funds and labour in them.

[Landsbergis] I think the mechanism of their actual transfer to Lithuania should be subject to negotiations. We have also invested our labour and funds in addition to everything else.

[Kyucharyants] What if protection of the USSR's economic interests, which are undoubtedly being harmed by Lithuania's withdrawal, called for economic sanctions? Regarding fuel, for example. Lithuania recieves fuel at subsidized prices: it pays 30 roubles for a ton of oil whereas a ton of oil on the world market is 110 dollars.

[Landsbergis] If you mean an energy blockade, this would be regrettable. I assure you, however, that we will look for ways out of this situation. If you mean a change in rates of payment, everything would depend in the final analysis on the price and the offers. This will decide where we buy our oil. We are implementing our economic reform both as regards legislation and practical matters and we believe we are free to solve any problems that arise independently.

[Kyucharyants] How do you visualize your first step along this road?

[Landsbergis] It has already been taken. We have founded the national bank of the Lithuanian Republic.

[Kyucharyants] Do you intend to raise the matter of the gold that was put in a bank in England before 1940 and then sold to make up for the losses of British industrialists?

[Landsbergis] The time will come to discuss this issue, too. France, for example, has announced that it will return to Lithuania the gold reserves which have been kept there since before the war and to which the USSR laid claim in vain since they are the property of the Lithuanian Republic. This will be done given stability and recognition of the Lithuanian government.

[Kyucharyants] It's no secret that the decision by Lithuania's Supreme Soviet to secede from the USSR has provoked sharp protests from many residents of the Republic. Especially those who are not Lithuanian: Russians, Ukrainians, Poles. They can't imagine their life outside Lithuania, outside the USSR. How do you propose to resolve this dilemma?

[Landsbergis] Restoration of the Lithuanian state will not harm any citizen of any nationality living in the republic. All citizens have the same Constitutional rights as Lithuanians. If they don't leave, but stay and help us build up our state, we shall welcome that. If some wish to leave Lithuania and settle in the USSR or any other country, all matters pertaining to this, including property matters, will be settled on the basis of the law of those countries and human goodwill.

[Kyucharyants] Don't you think an issue as important as Lithuania's secession from the USSR should be solved at least through a national referendum?

[Landsbergis] We are being told that our decision is not representative enough and hasty. Meanwhile, Lithuania has been insisting on its independence for 700 years now. As for a referendum, I can assure you that in a republic where 80 per cent of the population is Lithuanian, the majority would be in favour. Besides, in accordance with the Geneva convention, such a referendum cannot be held under occupation and settlers from the annexing country can't decide the future of the annexed country.

[Kyucharyants] Still there is no consensus on this issue in the republic.

[Landsbergis] The main reason, I think, is psychological pressure being brought to bear on us. First it was a helicopter scattering leaflets presenting a warped interpretation of our decision and called on the people to stage m'ssive protests. Now (as we speak), military aircraf are hovering over Vilnius. A Soviet airforce Colonel-General, Achalov, assured me that this was a scheduled exercise. This never happened before and people are scared. Just as they are scared by the rumours about taking Klaipeda away from Lithuania. What is one to make of the reported troops movements along the eastern border while Lithuania's Supreme Soviet was in session? Were they checking to see what changes in the state border might involve? Exercise? By some strange coincidence there was a major failure at the Television Centre...All this adds up to a picture of psychological pressure and there is nothing productive about that.

[Kyucharyants] For half a century Lithuania was a Soviet Republic and as such has been party to various international treaties signed by the USSR, economic, political or whatever. will you continue to honour these treaties?

[Landsbergis] Lithuania was never a legitimate part of the Soviet Union, thus treaties signed by the USSR do not apply to it. But we have treaties with Western countries signed before 1940 and then suspended as a result of our forced incorporation into the Soviet Union. Today we are considering in which form they could be continued.

[Kyucharyants] Does the March 11 decision by the Lithuanian Parliament mean that Lithuania will introduce entry and exit visas?

[Landsbergis] I think that visas should be introduced. We are discussing this matter. At this stage we are not discussing Soviet borders. This would unnecessarily make difficult our reciprocal contacts. I think there should be only goods and customs control on the border between Lithuania and the USSR and a passport regime to be agreed on.

[Kyucharyants] Do you think Mikhail Gorbachev's election to the presidency increases chances for understanding between Moscow and Vilnius?

[Landsbergis] It does not decrease them. [Landsbergis ends]

As this issue was going to press, Vladimir Kyucharyants called Vytautas Landsbergis to ask for his reaction to the statement by the USSR government (which expresses serious concern over developments in Lithuania).

[Landsbergis] The Statement by the USSR government, on the whole, is positive enough. It acknowledges the need for continued normal economic relations between Lithuania and the USSR and for contractual commitments to be honoured. This coincides with our proposal to Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov.

We are also interested in keeping transportation lines open and if the Soviet government's efforts are turned to technical renovations, this would certainly be sensible.

But we are surprised at the concern over the proposed introduction of Lithuanian money: this has long been proposed by Lithuanian and Estonian economists, and no stern warnings have ever come from the Ministry of Finance.

We are amazed by the untruths about state-run enterprises being urgently handed over to private owners.

As for concern over the safety of the Atomic Power Station, the greatest danger is its own design.

On the whole it can be said (and people over 50 confirm this), that the situation today is reminiscent of the situation in 1940, with its pressure, threats, uncertainty.

But hasn't the Soviet Union changed?

## Landsbergis Interviewed on Moscow's Stance

*PM2203152790 Copenhagen BERLINGSKE TIDENDE in Danish 21 Mar 90 p 9*

[Report on 19 March Vilnius interview with Lithuanian President Vytautas Landsbergis by Flemming Rose: "Returning to the Circle of European Democracies"]

[Text] Vilnius—The Baltic countries' struggle for independence has been called the "singing revolution." The whole thing started with the cultivation of their national cultural heritages and folk festivals in packed sports arenas and in large parks.

And while BERLINGSKE TIDENDE's correspondent sat eating supper and drinking tea late Monday evening [19 March] with President Vytautas Landsbergis, the music professor burst into song several times—perhaps to reinforce this image, perhaps to relax a little from the stressful situation in which the Lithuanian leader finds himself. He sits in his office in the government building from 0900 hours to 0500 hours and, asked how he copes with the enormous pressure of work, he smiled, made an expansive gesture, and said: "That's what it's like to make a revolution!"

From the nervous atmosphere in the building you have the feeling that history is being written in these days, hours, minutes...

"Lithuania is returning to the family of European democracies." That is how 57-year-old Landsbergis put it in his appeal to the democratic world after the election of the new Lithuanian leadership.

The telephones rang constantly, and at regular intervals people came rushing into the room to inform the president of the situation around Lithuania. In the middle of our conversation Landsbergis was presented with the Soviet Government's reaction to Lithuania's continued insistence that the country has reestablished its sovereign rights as an independent state.

[Rose] Is this is a step in the right direction, running on the spot, or a backward step in the war of nerves between Lithuania and Moscow?

[Landsbergis] It is of course a step in the right direction, for now a businesslike exchange is beginning. Particularly in respect of the maintenance and continuation of economic ties. Earlier we sent a special message to Soviet Prime Minister Ryzhkov stating that it is desirable that we maintain ties and observe existing agreements on deliveries.

Our message was read out at the Congress of People's Deputies in Moscow last week and met with dissatisfaction in the hall. But the Soviet Government has now accepted this view.

[Rose] Does this mean that Lithuania's relationship with Moscow is now moving into a new phase?

[Landsbergis] Yes. A difficult, but completely normal round of talks is now beginning. No hysterical shouts or threats are heard. And if the Soviet Union finds it necessary to make safe Lithuania's nuclear power stations, then they are welcome to send capable specialists to look after safety and make sure that potential madmen don't get in to press the buttons. That is our only worry.

And we have also said that transit communications via Lithuania will function irreproachably and Soviet interests will be guaranteed. Our only condition is that this must not happen through the use of force.

There is a very interesting warning in the reply from the Soviet Government. The introduction of ownership laws

in Estonia and Lithuania has already been under discussion for a year and there have never been any threats on this score. But now there is a warning that if Lithuania violates the unity of the Soviet Union's credit and financial system this will be considered to be in conflict with the Soviet Union's interests. That may well be the case. But it may also be the case that it is now a separate state that is taking economic decisions which are not in harmony with the Soviet Union's interests. This can be taken either as a statement of fact or as a threat.

The question is: "To what extent will the Soviet Union use force or coercion in pleading its own legitimate interests?"

As is well known, empires have always accused disobedient colonies of breaking laws and hurting the empire's interests. Branding all freedom-seeking steps as a crime, as the theft of the empire's property, is an old method.

That is one way of reading the text.

The question of what is the Soviet Union's property and what is not will be discussed in the negotiations between Lithuania and the Soviet Union.

When Lithuania adopted changes to the constitution last year which stated that all lands and forests, all enterprises and banks, the transport network and so on belong to Lithuania, there were no threats from Moscow. It was a normal constitutional situation.

But now that a law has been adopted to the effect that union enterprises in Lithuania are under the jurisdiction of the Lithuanian republic, a warning from the Soviet Government has followed.

The only real difference between today and a year ago is that today Lithuania is an independent state.

And if the Soviet Union is now stressing so strongly that it cannot accept individual decrees, it is admitting at the same time that the situation has changed fundamentally. A year ago the Soviet Union did not protest so strongly.

[Rose] What view do you take of the Danish Government's cautious reaction to Lithuania's declaration of independence?

[Landsbergis] Denmark is not among the countries which have given us the greatest support. Denmark has clearly not yet tried being a part of the Soviet Union.

I hope that the countries of the West will give a clear indication of their position if the Soviet Union continues the aggression it began in 1940.

Possible future Soviet troop increases and military control of Lithuanian territory will be considered to be acts of war. Something that we have already had experienced.

On the whole, there is today much that is reminiscent of the situation in 1940. The only difference is that Mikhail Gorbachev is not Stalin and Eduard Shevardnadze is not Vyacheslav Molotov. But that is a very important difference.

## Baltic Komsomol Leaders in Press Conference

*LD1304222690 Moscow TASS in English 2152 GMT 13 Apr 90*

[Text] Moscow April 14 TASS—By TASS correspondents: Relations between Baltic youth organisations and the All-Union Young Communist League (YCL) [Komsomol] and the communist parties of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia were the subject of a news conference held here by the leaders of young communist leagues of the three republics within the framework of the Komsomol's current 21st congress.

"A very unpleasant situation has developed in Latvia for the republican Young Communist League," said Janis Urbanovic, first secretary of the Latvian YCL.

"The split of the Latvian Communist Party is an accomplished fact. However, the Lettish YCL adheres to complete neutrality. A YCL conference will be held in May to consider its attitude to communist parties.

"We shall support a party which we shall be able to trust," Urbanovic emphasised.

The principle of independence of the Young Communist League was listed as paramount in the republican YCL rules adopted recently, said Nikolay Gogulan, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Estonian YCL.

Therefore it will build relations with the republic's communist parties in the same way as with other political organisations, the goals and tasks of which are close to it, he added.

Each organisation, Gogulan said, should have a right to political self-determination. The Estonian YCL has given an opportunity to people of various political views to form organisations. Funds for launching the activities of new youth organisations have been provided by Estonian YCL.

The largest number of questions was addressed to representatives of two young communist leagues of Lithuania—Vladimir Avdeyenko, secretary of the republican YCL centre which is part of the all-union YCL, and Alfonsas Macaitis, first secretary of the "independent" YCL of Lithuania.

"The two YCL organisations do not enjoy great popularity now," Macaitis said. The registration carried out following the Lithuanian YCL's latest 22nd congress, at which a split between them occurred, has shown that only 74,000 people out of the previously registered 380,000 people YCL'ers joined the independent league, he pointed out.

Avdeyenko said that the pro-union Lithuanian YCL has about 36,000 members.

The leaders of the two youth leagues said the ethnic composition of their organisations approximately reflects that of Lithuania in general (80 per cent of Lithuanians and 20 per cent of members of other nationalities). They are divided by different attitudes to the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet's act on the proclamation of the republic's independence.

At the same time, contradictions over the question of property between the two leagues are not so acute as those between the two communist parties of Lithuania, the YCL leaders said.

### Revival of Estonian 'Paramilitary Structures'

*PM1504142990 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 12 Apr 90 First Edition p 4*

[Senior Lieutenant N. Sorokin article in reply to reader's question under the rubric "Who's Who": "Is 'Kaitseliit' Making a Comeback?"—first paragraph is reader's question to "Phone-In" feature]

[Excerpts] "I have read more than once that some paramilitary structures are being created or revived in the Baltic, but there is no specific information available. So what is this: Rumor?"—S. Chernyak, Ufa.

The revival of paramilitary structures which existed in the bourgeois Baltic republics is certainly no rumor. An example of this is the revival of the notorious "Kaitseliit" ("Defense Union") organization in Estonia. [passage omitted]

"Kaitseliit" is now being resurrected from the ashes and the active process of forming its renewed structure is under way. On 24 February this year the newspaper RAHVA HAAL reported, for example, that a constituent meeting of "Kaitseliit" supporters had been held in Estonia's Raplasskiy Rayon. It stressed that it is being formed for the sole purpose of providing "protection against growing crime." True, at other similar meetings, particularly the one held in Tallinn 4 March, speakers were more specific and unequivocal on this matter. One of them, H. Eller, for example, said that the main task of "Kaitseliit" will be to "ensure the safety of Estonian citizens, primarily in rural areas, and to train officer cadres for the future national self-defense forces of independent Estonia." The idea was also voiced that "Kaitseliit" should "train Estonians in active self-defense, including armed self-defense."

So far, branches of the organization have been set up in Valgaskiy Rayon, Paydeskiy Rayon, Pyarnuskiy Rayon, and several other rayons in the republic. One striking fact is that in a number of cases the initiative is being taken by the local authorities themselves. Another characteristic feature is that some formations are headed by staffers of the Estonian Internal Affairs Ministry. Examples are Captain M. Kasepold from the Raplasskiy Rayon Internal Affairs Department, Militia Senior Lieutenant J. Rahkema, a senior inspector with the highway patrol, and I. Kruuze, a former militiaman...

The many foreign "supporters of perestroyka" are closely following the development of these processes in Estonia. Following their development and playing an interested role in them. For example, U.S. Army Colonel Toomepuu, who paid a visit to the republic last month, wholeheartedly supported the idea of young Estonians refusing to do Soviet Army service. He promised that, "if the republic is restored, the United States will not refuse assistance in organizing training and acquiring weapons for 'Kaitseliit.'" I must point out that these and other statements by Toomepuu have been eagerly relayed by the Estonian mass media. And, as a rule, without any commentary.

Clearly, the revival of "Kaitseliit" must be viewed in close connection with the complex events taking place in Estonia. It is an integral part of the plans of separatist forces and has their full support and encouragement. Evidently some people here are impatient to move away from parliamentary discussions and toward more decisive action.

### More on 'Rebirth'

*LD1204212390 Tallinn PAEVALEHT in Estonian 22 Mar 90 p 2 (tentative)*

[Article by Vaapo Vehre: "Defense League Gathers Strength"]

[Excerpts] Recently the most wide-ranging citizens's initiative in Estonia to have reached its first noteworthy landmark was the convening of the Estonian Congress. And yet, for some foreign journalists perhaps even greater interest was aroused by the young men with yellow armbands on guard in front of the "Estonia" [theater hall where the Congress was held] than the materials of the Congress.

That was the first public appearance of the restored Kaitseliit [Defense League] in the Estonian capital. [passage omitted]

[Question] Mr. Kalle Eller, you have been one of the initiators for restoring the Defense League. [passage omitted] Is not time ripe for the rebirth of the Defense League?

[Eller] The time is largely what it was over 70 years ago. Again talks have been set which only the KL [Defense League] can solve. Three main aims face the Defense League: first, to raise the readiness for defense among citizens; second, to take upon itself the obligations of the army in certain situations; third, cooperation with the law-and-order structures over the defense of citizens' lives, health, and property. The Defense League is a movement of self-initiative and can at present develop only in the way of citizens's initiative.

[Question] How far have you come?

[Eller] First groups came together in Tartu a year ago. In the summer and autumn groups were set up in Harju and Laane districts [around Tallinn and Haapsalu]. [passage omitted]

Starting a local organization takes place strictly in the way of local initiative—at a popular meeting where the resolution is put to vote, a board and its chairman are elected. That way the movement has a firm juridical foundation. The minimum age [for membership] at the moment is 15 years. [passage omitted]

### Estonian Defense League on People's Protection

*LD1204212290 Tallinn Estonian Television Network in Estonian 1900 GMT 24 Mar 90*

[Excerpts] [Announcer] At Alutaguse now the Kaitseliit [Defense League] has been restored.

[Kalle Eller, identified by a caption as one of the members of the temporary Kaitseliit board] Well, I see the main task of the Defense League as ensuring a peaceful milieu here, so that no atmosphere of terror can develop, or an atmosphere of anxiety. The Defense League must become so strong here that it ensures a calm situation.

[Unidentified correspondent] What should the relations of the Defense League and the Law-and-Order League be?

[Eller] first and foremost the relations between the Defense League and the Law-and-Order League should be good, and not competitive, because their tasks are ultimately quite different. The Defense League is a mass organization, mainly a military organization, and the Law-and-Order League should be a less numerous, voluntary police, with those people joining who understand clearly that they wish in essence to act as policemen. [passage omitted]

[Correspondent] What will become of (?the support) of Narva, Sillamae and Kohtla-Jarve to the Defense League? And that goes also for Tallinn, (?for supporting) the city? [these are towns with a substantial Russian population]

[Eller] Evidently we hope that these relations will turn out to be peaceful. We do not expect that at present the population over there would like to or would join the Defense League but we would still like them to understand that in essence the Defense League is also for their defense. [video shows mostly young men sitting indoors, looking serious, a speaker and interview with Eller]

### People's Front Adopts Appeal on Lithuania

*LD1604110190 Tallinn Domestic Service in Estonian 1700 GMT 15 Apr 90*

[Text] The meeting of the Council of the People's Front which took place today also adopted an appeal [words indistinct].

The Estonian People's Front protests categorically against the threats of the USSR leadership to use an economic blockade in order to repress [word indistinct] resolution of the Lithuanian Republic. That constitutes a USSR aggression against the Lithuanian Republic. The Estonian People's Front appeals to all establishments, enterprises, organizations, movements, associations, unions, and private individuals to be prepared to support the people of Lithuania, both morally as well as materially. The fate of Estonia and of all the Baltic lands [words indistinct] in Lithuania at present. [passage indistinct] Now it is our will and [word indistinct] which are at stake.

### Estonia Adopts Military Service Law

*LD1304145990 Moscow World Service in Russian 0930 GMT 13 Apr 90*

[Text] The second session of the Supreme Soviet of Estonia has ended in Tallinn. Just before the close, it adopted a law on service by the inhabitants of the republic in the armed services of the USSR during the transitional period. It does not recognize universal liability for military service and removes punishment under the criminal law for avoidance of call-up into the army. A majority of deputies voted for this law.

Many parliamentarians, however, refused to take part in the voting. One of them, representing the primarily Russian-speaking population of northeastern Estonia, said that in Kohtla-Jarve the local soviet does not recognize the decision of Estonia's parliament.

### Deputies Vote Against Law

*LD1304163690 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0830 GMT 13 Apr 90*

[Report by TASS correspondent Aleksandr Kharchenko]

[Text] Tallinn, 13 Apr (TASS)—Two documents, which go beyond the limits of what is usual, have just been adopted by an Estonian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet session. Such is the opinion of S. Petinov, deputy of the republican parliament and chairman of the executive committee of the United Council of Labor Collectives.

"I mean the message to USSR President Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and the law on service by Estonian SSR inhabitants in the USSR Armed Forces in the interim period," he told the TASS correspondent.

S. Petinov was among 27 people's deputies who refused to accept these documents. Why did he not join in the vote?

"The message to the USSR president synthesizes all those moves which were made earlier by the republic. They sum up the legal basis for secession from the USSR," S. Petinov replied.

It is not only the disruption of the spring call-up in the republic that is created by the resolutions, along with the law on service by Estonian SSR inhabitants in the USSR Armed Forces in the interim period, he believes. They signify the supension of the law on universal military service on the territory of the Estonian SSR. In this we can see a serious step toward undermining the country's defense capability and a repeat of the "Lithuanian Scenario." The deputies who refused to vote for the message to the USSR president and the law on military service believe that the activity of the Estonian Supreme Soviet today is aimed at the collapse of the Soviet Union, the elimination of Soviet power in Estonia, and the restoration of the Estonian republic on the 1939 model. It is to this end that an interim period has been unilaterally declared.

In a short interval of time, the supreme body of power in the republic has adopted decisions which declare the state authority of the USSR on Estonian territory illegal and the USSR Constitution invalid. This, we believe, has initiated a coup d'etat and a change in the constitutional system.

This and other documents which were adopted earlier are grounded in references to the Tartu Peace Treaty which was concluded between Estonia and the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] in 1920 and in the "occupation and annexation" of Estonia by the Soviet Union 20 years later, which allegedly continue to this day. At the same time, the Declaration of the State Duma on the entry of Estonia into the Soviet Union in July 1940 is declared legally invalid.

All the historical and legal investigations by local specialists are, in our opinion, lacking in objectivity and are tendentious since they are based on disparate facts without any in-depth analysis of the political, economic, international and military situation of the times.

A distorted view of the true state of affairs is being formed among the population of the republic, as well as beyond its borders and abroad. This is urging separatist forces toward still more vigorous actions and is fanning inter-ethnic strife.

Most members of the republican parliament, along with some USSR people's deputies from the Estonian SSR deem as unacceptable the USSR law on the procedure for dealing with issues connected with the secession of a Union republic from the USSR, referring to the fact that Estonia has never been part of the Soviet Union.

In this way a situation of legal arbitariness and anarchy has been created in the republic today and the dead-end "Lithuanian situation" is being repeated, the deputy said. The situation is made worse by the real possibility of political crisis in the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet, which would have unpredictable consequences.

In this complex situation there is a way out. It is essential to form commissions of independent and competent people, which will provide a fair assessment of the Tartu Peace Treaty and events linked to Estonia's joining of the Soviet Union. There is great need for a legal and historical expert examination of the documents and events mentioned above. This should be done by specialists at an international level!

"We believe," S. Petinov said, in conclusion, "that it is essential to send permanent representatives of the USSR Supreme Soviet, under the leadership of one of the members of the Presidential Council, to Estonia and a group of experts to assess the situation that has come about and to adopt fundamental measures to restore the norms of Soviet law on Estonian territory."

## Estonian People's Front Prepares for Congress

*LD1604102290 Tallinn Domestic Service in Estonian 1700 GMT 15 Apr 90*

[Interview on 15 April with Edgar Savisaar, prime minister of Estonia and a leader of the People's Front, by Ott Kool; place of interview not specified]

[Excerpts] [Announcer] The Estonian People's Front is preparing for its second congress. For this reason the Council of the People's Front met today. Ott Kool reports.

[Kool] What is the present state of the People's Front, Edgar Savisaar?

[Savisaar] The present state of the People's Front is good. The Council today discussed preparations for the second people's congress on 26-27 May. In a week's time reregistration of support groups will begin, with reformation and renaming of local leading bodies wherever necessary.

Today Ulo Kaevats and several other leaders of the People's Front spoke about changes which are necessary in the charter and in the program, and asked how one is to proceed now that our status has changed, because we [now] participate in the work of the Supreme Soviet and are no longer a pressure group, having taken it upon ourselves to bear part of the responsibility. I had a feeling that the speeches of practically all the speakers carried the same sentiment. In any case, those elections [to the Supreme Soviet] and the results (?have been good) for the People's Front. [passage omitted]

[Kool] Edgar Savisaar, but what indeed constitutes at the moment the most acute, the most critical aspect?

[Savisaar] The most critical aspect at the moment is as it was for [words indistinct] (?Czech) citizens' forum as well as for [Polish] Solidarity, and for Sajudis after they became a force to be reckoned with in the governments of their countries' parliaments. It is very important at the moment that the People's Front not become weak. It is clear that a number of People's Front leaders cross over into the state apparatus. It is necessary at the moment that both the people's support as well as the people's control over the parliament and the government continue.

[Kool] I conclude from what you have said that a new generation of leaders should grow and that there is a need for young men from the localities and that the People's Front is indeed a very good political school for one to try his hand and engage in politics in Estonia.

[Savisaar] It is a good political school, demonstrated by the success of those people who have grown out of the People's Front and [words indistinct] [passage omitted]

### New Estonian Government Starts Work

*LD1404110290 Moscow TASS in English 1049 GMT 14 Apr 90*

[By TASS correspondent Albert Maloveryan]

[Text] Tallinn April 14 TASS—A new Estonian Government headed by former Minister of Economy Edgar Savisaar began its activities.

Some local observers and members of the republic's parliament predict that the government will not last long. Deputy Yulo Uluoto believes that the government will exist only till June, even if Savisaar manages to fill in all the vacancies in the half-formed government.

The parliament has not confirmed the appointment of Toomas Symer as communications minister. According to Savisaar, this resulted from a suspicion against those who worked at their posts for a long time in the stagnation years. Suspicions overwhelmed competence and professionalism.

The majority of other ministers are newcomers. Some of them held no state posts before.

The government's first sitting discussed financial issues, prices policy and the reorganisation of the republican state security bodies (KGB).

### Estonian Government Holds First Meetings

*LD1604113390 Tallinn Domestic Service in Estonian 1700 GMT 13 Apr 90*

[Excerpts] [Announcer] Today's date, for us in Estonia, will be marked by the first session of the new government. Ain Saarna has been to Toompea [seat of government in Tallinn].

[Saarna] Journalists obtained information about the government session at a press conference. Prime Minister Edgar Savisaar was not at all perturbed that the first session of the new government took place on Friday the 13th; the date is likely to be remembered better [that way]. The leader of the government also opined that his government will not collapse in June, over the presenting of the budget, like Supreme Soviet Deputy Ulo Uluots forecast in the press. [passage omitted]

An important subject was the Baltic Market contract which was concluded yesterday in Vilnius. Today Mart Tarmak was appointed the Estonian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] government's permanent representative of Lithuania. In the near future, one from Latvia will be in Estonia. [passage omitted]

Under the leadership of Prime Minister Edgar Savisaar, a commission will start work to reorganize the work of the Estonian SSR State Security Committee. [passage omitted]

[Government Counsellor Pedak] It will be attempted once again to elucidate some problems including conscription of the young men into the Army and the attitude to the alternative service. As is known, the USSR defense minister has on several occasions refused the republican leadership the possibility of organizing alternative service in Estonia. [passage omitted]

### Estonian Communists To Remain Part of CPSU

*LD1404130190 Moscow TASS in English 1244 GMT 14 Apr 90*

[By ETA correspondent Ruta Pels]

[Text] Tallinn April 14 TASS—Estonia did not follow Lithuania's example: The recent 20th congress of the Estonian Communist Party decided that during the six-month period of transition to independence the party organisationally will remain part of the Soviet Communist Party (CPSU).

However, the congress adopted a programme proclaiming the party's transformation into an independent party that will be part of Estonia's political system.

"The Communist Party of Estonia will act on the basis of its programme and organisational principles, based on general human values of Marxism and new political thinking," the programme says.

"Only an independent Communist Party of Estonia can efficiently participate in the political life of Estonia, change tactics in a flexible way, form coalitions and compete with other parties and movements."

Party Chairman Vayno Vyalyas and First Secretary Enn-Arno Sillari appealed to the Communist Party, saying that "practical deeds for the benefit of the homeland are now expected from communists" and adding that "civil peace, cooperation and the calm and business-like solution of all problems are needed for this."

The activity of the coalition Central Committee shows an example of such cooperation. The Central Committee includes two factions—one advocating an independent Communist Party in an independent Estonia, and the other favouring unity with the CPSU.

The 18-member pro-Moscow Central Committee, elected by 141 delegates immediately after the 20th congress, represents some party organisations of ethnic Russians in Tallinn.

The split in the Estonian Communist Party has not been officially sealed. Each of the republic's 106,000 Communists will have to make a choice before autumn. Perhaps, much will depend on decisions of the 28th CPSU congress.

### Committee for Soviet Power Meets Press

*90UN1229A Tallinn SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA in Russian 3 Mar 90 p 1*

[Article by A. Podvezko: "Views Do Not Coincide in All Respects..."]

[Text] A press conference was conducted yesterday in Tallinn (if one can so call an event in which just four representatives of the republic press take part) organized by the Committee for the Protection of Soviet Power and Civil Rights in Estonia. Responding to journalists' questions on how to explain the minimal presence of press representatives in the room, the organizers of the meeting expressed their regret that the republic's mass media are attempting to ignore the committee's activity. They confirmed at the same time, however, that invitations were issued to just five publications.

In acquainting the media representatives with committee activity, A. Gusev, first secretary of the Morskoy Raykom [rayon committee] of the Estonian Communist Party, explained that since its inception the committee has gained the support of the ispolkoms [executive committee] of Kokhtla-Yarve, Sillamyae, and Narva, of 168 enterprises and organizations, and of almost all the military units billeted in Estonia.

Support committees are being formed in the localities—35 have been created so far. These committees are to organize a campaign to collect signatures in defense of the unity of the Soviet Union and of Soviet authority in Estonia. They will uncover specific instances of encroachment on the rights of the population by local organs of authority, and demand justice.

Intermovement and the United Council of Labor Collectives have decided to submit to the decisions of our committee, which includes their representatives. Thus the committee today is a unique kind of coordinating center.

It has declared illegal and invalid (?) the 6 December 1989 Resolution of the Estonian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet "On the Organization of Military Service of Citizens of the Estonian SSR," as well as the decisions of the Tartu and Tallinn city soviets "On the Law on Universal Military Service." The committee has demanded that the Estonian SSR prosecutor protest these decisions as not being in conformity with the USSR Constitution.

The committee is also involved in legislative activity—it has prepared an opinion on the draft Estonian SSR Law on Immigration, and has approved a draft law on referendum drawn up by the United Council of Labor Collectives executive committee.

Regarding plans for the near future, A. Gusev provided information concerning joint sessions of local soviets of the northeastern region conducted with the aim of "determining their position in the event Estonia leaves the USSR." In his words, these two processes—self-determination of Estonia and the establishment of an autonomous oblast—go hand in hand.

In the second half of March, the committee intends to conduct a grandiose republic demonstration "to enlist the support of the workers..."

The remainder of the journalists' questions amounted essentially to an appraisal of the political situation in the republic, and were answered by committee representatives Yu. Stefanovskiy, member of the Intermovement coordinating council presidium; S. Petinov, chairman of the United Council of Labor Collectives executive committee; and N. Aksinin, chairman of the presidium of the Union of Veterans of War and the Armed Forces and Internationalist Soldiers of the Estonian SSR. The views expressed by the respondents, as they themselves admitted, did not coincide in all respects, and the committee's position therefore has remained somewhat unclear on the whole...

### Party of Estonian Entrepreneurs Formed

*90UN1229B Tallinn SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA in Russian 4 Mar 90 p 2*

[Article by R. Amos, ETA: "Entrepreneurs Engaged in Politics"]

[Text] Three swallows flying to the right (or to the east), strongly suggestive of inverted letter "E" 's, symbolize the Party of Entrepreneurs of Estonia. The new party, which conducted its constituent congress 2 March, calls itself a voluntary right-wing political association in support of enterprise, competition, and a market economy in an independent Estonian society.

In his review of today's pressing political situation, Tiyt Made noted that a broad left-oriented faction has already been created in Estonia, but there is no bloc of rightist parties. The Party of Entrepreneurs of Estonia intends, along with other right-wing groups, to fight for the independent future of Estonia in the name of improving our lives.

The new party has set for itself the goal of participating in the restoration of Estonia's state independence and autonomy, in the creation of its new economic structure and development of economic components, and in the revival of Estonia's production traditions. The party will also support improvements in the quality of our environment, judicious and efficient use of the means of production, and of natural and human resources, and the essential activity of entrepreneurs. Any Estonian citizen

or individual in the process of obtaining Estonian citizenship who has reached the age of 18 and accepts the party's charter and program may become a member of the Party of Entrepreneurs of Estonia. Persons who belong to another party or political group, servicemen, and individuals who have compromised themselves during the years of Soviet power will not be accepted as members.

We will now address certain provisions of the program of the Party of Entrepreneurs of Estonia.

Domestic policy. The party will strive to achieve the independence of Estonia and the accomplishment of all provisions of the Tartu Peace Treaty concluded 2 February 1920 between Estonia and the Soviet Union. The only possible way to conduct domestic policy is by parliamentary democracy and a mechanism of state authority established on democratic principles. In its political activity, the party will proceed from a position of defending the interests of the indigenous nation, and of cooperating with the representatives of all peoples residing in Estonia who are prepared to assist in the development of Estonian society on principles of mutual understanding and mutual respect.

Foreign policy. We should conduct an active policy of neutrality and participate in the activity of international organizations. The party supports the concepts and policy of a nonnuclear Northern Europe and Baltic region. Demilitarization and disarmament are vitally necessary for the development of free enterprise and a market economy.

Economic policy. The only possible basis of Estonian economic development can be a democratic market economy based on free initiative and energetic labor. The bases of ownership relationships in Estonia must comprise state, cooperative, and private ownership. The interrelationships among these forms of ownership are established on the basis of competition, and not a command economy. An economic structure should be revived in Estonia that conforms to production traditions and to natural and human resources. Its cornerstones, in the view of the party, lie in small-scale production facilities and individual farmsteads, judicious and sparing utilization of the Earth's depths, thrift, good management, efficiency, prudence, and profitability.

Social and educational policy. Members of society enjoy equal social and legal rights. It is society's responsibility to materially provide for the aged, students, the disabled, and young families. Society should create a developed system of public health care not based on its ability to pay its own way. Material support of education, culture, and health care—this is the concern of the Estonian state and its entrepreneurs.

Ethnic policy. Blame for the destruction of a unified Estonian society lies with the Stalinist-Brezhnev ethnic policies of the Soviet Union. Migration policies pursued by the central authority endangered the preservation of our nation as a single entity and increased the danger of our being a minority in our own original territory. The basis of stable interethnic relations should be the social equality of all citizens of the Estonian Republic and distribution of material benefits in accordance with work performed.

State defense policy. To provide for the defense of the Estonian Republic, we must reconstitute our own professional armed forces and introduce a system of mandatory service. Pursuing an active policy of neutrality, Estonia should not join any military alliance and should not permit a single military base to be situated on its territory. Persons who, for religious or other reasons, are not willing to fulfill their military obligation should be afforded the opportunity of performing alternative service. The party believes it is necessary to reconstitute the state police and security service of Estonia, as entities subordinate to the parliament.

Tiyt Made was elected chairman of the new party's governing body.

## Breakaway Latvian Communists Meet 14 Apr

*LD1404060390 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0509 GMT 14 Apr 90*

[Excerpt] Riga, 14 Apr (TASS)—TASS correspondent Galina Kuchina reports: Those in favor of creating an independent Latvian Communist Party met today at its constituent forum in the hall of the state university of this Baltic republic. They are that third of the delegates of the 25th Latvian Communist Party Congress, which took place last week, who walked out of the conference hall, stating their intention to create an independent party, not organizationally linked to the CPSU.

An action committee has been working here at the university in recent months. It has decided to unite those in favor of a completely independent organization. Their platform's main principles are the Latvian Communists' withdrawal from the CPSU and the republic's secession from the USSR. This program was not supported by the majority of the 25th congress, which was still a united event, and so "the independents" left it.

However, the door is not closed for those who want to return. Vacant places have been left in the elected bodies and within the Central Committee leadership's composition. However, in the opinion of many, it is unlikely that in the near future a dialogue will be possible between this public-political organization's two opposed wings.

Today at the congress in the university around 530 delegates will be discussing the situation which has come about. There will also be a report on the historical path of the Latvian Communist Party—one of the oldest in the world. It was founded in 1904 and is now experiencing the most profound crisis in its history.

The split has occured not only along national lines, but along social ones. A boundary has also come between

party members who represent the cities and the countryside. Although rural regions where, on the whole, the native population lives, are waiting for the creation of a peasant party, many have attached themselves to the 'independent' communists. The present organizing committee of the congress supposes that there will be 30,000 people in the ranks of the independent Communist Party. A week ago the united detachment of communists in the republic was 177,000 people. [passage omitted]

## Riga Radio on Independent LCP Congress

### Commissions, Agenda Approved

*LD1404171290*

[Editorial Report] Riga Domestic Service in Latvian at 0655 GMT on 14 April begins carrying live the constituent congress of the independent Communist Party of Latvia (LCP) from the Great Hall of the Latvian State University in Riga.

At 0703 GMT Alfreds Cepanis opens the congress and says that of the 579 delegates elected, 565 are present. A six-member congress presidium is proposed and approved unanimously.

By 0720 GMT vote counters, secretariat, mandate commission, editorial commission, vote counting commission, agenda—issued in written form to delegates—and procedural schedule are all approved.

At 0721 GMT a report is read by Marite Rukmane. She speaks of the decision to found an independent Communist Party of Latvia, the 25th LCP Congress, and the 28th CPSU Congress. The party should unite people of all nationalities she says. There are no objections to conservatives leaving the party, but in the LCP on the CPSU platform leadership only four rayons are represented, whereas Daugavpils is represented by five members. Support for Gorbachev is important. Among the independent Communist Party supporters there are no conservatives she says. The independent Communist Party supporters were unable to express their opinions at the 25th congress. Rukmane outlines future goals. She says the name of the party has to be changed, and she proposes a referendum on this to be held at the next congress. There is no basis for forming a conciliation commission with the CPSU territorial party she says, and concludes with an appeal for unity, ending at 0740 GMT.

At 0743 GMT Ilga Gore reviews historical aspects of party activity. She says materials on the events of 1959 should be published and those punished should be rehabilitated.

At 0805 GMT Juris Rozenvalds speaks on the future activity and goals of the independent Communist Party. He says the draft documents avoid mentioning socialism or capitalism intentionally. He details several corrections to the drafts and talks about how the party should not interfere in the activities of various state bodies. The draft documents he says, include proposals for the independent Communist Party to support sovereignty and the independence of Latvia based on the 1922 Constitution. Another proposal concerns agrarian policy. On the issue of a new name for the party, Rozenvalds agrees with the idea of a referendum. He says the title of Easter Party is a significant one in so far as rebirth is concerned.

At 0823 GMT Karlis Podnieks speaks about the party's rules and structure, how officials are to be elected and their duties. He says the congress is to elect 37 Central Committee members, with 36 members to be elected in the rayons. A chairman of the party and other officials are to be elected. He ends at 0834 GMT.

### Lithuanian Support Proclaimed

*LD1404174490*

[Editorial Report] Riga Domestic Service in Latvian continues live coverage of the constituent congress of the independent Latvian Communist Party from the Great Hall of the Latvian State University in Riga.

At 0835 GMT debate begins with the first speaker being Mihails Naglis, party primary organization secretary from Ogre Rayon.

At 0842 GMT Aivars Ozers talks about the situation in Riga Rayon.

At 0848 GMT Vilis Krumins speaks, congratulating everyone for the restoration of an independent Communist Party. There are many difficulties ahead, but with unity these could be overcome, he says. Some people reproach him, he says, saying that he cares only for the Latvian people. He says his reply is that this is not so, but that he thinks the rebirth of the Latvian people should not become its sunset.

At 0900 GMT Cepanis reads a proposal for laying flowers at the Monument of Liberty and at the Monument to Rainis, a Latvian poet and dramatist.

After some procedural announcements by Cepanis the congress adjourns for lunch until 1030 GMT.

The congress resumes at 1032 GMT with Cepanis announcing the next speaker.

At 1032 GMT a speaker, in the name of Bauska Rayon delegates, proposes adopting a resolution of support to the Lithuanian people and legislature.

At 1039 GMT Vladimir (?Konolov) from Rezekne speaks in Russian about the relations between the party and the People's Front.

At 1044 GMT an unidentified speaker comments on the difficulties in Lithuania and cites the lack of support from the West. He agrees with Kezbers that if Gorbachev succeeds, "so do we". Independence in Latvia is only an intermediate step for a high living standard.

At 1050 GMT Aivars Baumanis, chairman of the Union of Journalists, talks about the press. The closing of RIGAS BALSS was the first indication that the past could return. The Communist Party control of the press, transferred from government control in 1967, has been talked about adequately, he says, but he warns of new moves by the government. There are difficulties because there are now two Communist Parties.

At 1059 GMT Lubova Zile, director of party History Institute, talks about how this party stands for independence and sovereignty. History is important, but she is concerned about the possible fate of archive documents in the future. She thinks that the party archives should come under government control. She is also concerned about the future of her institute, and about Lithuania. She says a political solution should be found there, since by force nothing can be achieved.

At 1106 GMT Ervid Grinovskis, USSR People's Deputy, talks about independence. He expresses support for Lithuania. He says de facto independence must be achieved, "de jure independence we already have." Attempts to restore the Russian empire should be resisted, he says, the time for empires is over. He continues about the place of the party in the new political spectrum and the importance of history. Grinovskis continues a little about the economy and agriculture. He recommends for the party's leadership Kezbers, Cepanis, and Rukmane and ends with the "God bless Latvia!"

At 1119 GMT Adolfs Varslavans from Valmiera Rayon thinks that communist should be taken out of the title of the party. He supports Lithuania and comdemns the Latvians in the other party.

At 1124 GMT Daumants Azatnajs speaks about finances.

### Relations With CPSU Discussed

*LD1404183690*

[Editorial Report] Riga Domestic Service in Latvian continues live coverage of the constituent congress of the independent Latvian Communist Party from the Great Hall of the Latvian State University in Riga.

At 1129 GMT a Jurmala doctor, speaking in Russian, mentions Kezbers, Bresis, Rukmane, Cepanis, and Gorbunovs as possible leaders.

At 1138 GMT Rukmane reads some greetings, some poetry, and congratulations to Vagris for his strength of character at the previous congress. Rukmane says she hopes that Vagris is listening.

At 1141 GMT Kezbers speaks and asks "shall we go together or not?" explaining that some in the other party did not agree even with what Gorbachev had agreed to. Independence and sovereignty was a strategic goal. He speaks about left-wing forces, social democracy's role, the work ahead, and attention to rural areas. On relations with the CPSU, he proposes sending a letter to Moscow explaining the new party. He thinks representatives should be sent to Vilnius, Tallinn, and Moscow to establish contacts. There is work ahead, he says, especially in connection with the Supreme Soviet on 3 May.

At 1150 GMT speaking on behalf of the mandate commission, Anatolijs Cistjakovs gives detailed figures on the number of supporters of the independent Communist Party and on the delegates' personal details. He ends his report and then explains the procedure for exchanging registration cards for mandate cards.

At 1203 GMT Vilnis Bresis speaks and tells the congress that they acted correctly. While the title of the party is important, he says, there are other important aspects. Independence can not mean isolation; political contacts have to be sought everywhere, including among conservative forces, in other republics, and abroad. Bresis continues about the envisaged market reforms in the Union and says these have to be taken into account.

At 1214 GMT Kondrats Sonders, a medical expert from the Leningradas Rayon of Riga, speaks. He says it needs to be shown that not all communists think like Rubiks and Klaucens. He proposes that Baltic Military District Commander Kuzmin return the Riga Latvian Society's building.

At 1226 GMT a proposal by Sonders on satisfactory Central Committee's work during recent years is approved.

At 1230 GMT proposals to end the debate are adopted and at 1232 GMT the congress adjourns for 30 minutes.

### Kezbers Elected Chairman

*LD1404191390*

[Editorial Report] Riga Domestic Service in Latvian at 1302 GMT on 14 April resumes its live coverage of the constituent congress of the independent Latvian Communist Party from the Great Hall of the Latvian State University in Riga.

At 1304 GMT Cepanis reads several congratulatory telegrams, including one in Russian from the organizational secretariat of the Liberal Democratic Alliance in Moscow; these are received with applause.

At 1308 GMT Juris Rozenvalds reads on behalf of the Editorial Commission a decision for discussion and confirmation by the congress, which consists of a number of items, including:

—how the independent Communist Party can overcome its crisis and gain the confidence of the people;
—the historical decision to include the independent Communist Party with the Bolsheviks;
—on the title of this party, provisionally the independent Communist Party of Latvia;

—on a commission to promote restructuring in the USSR;
—a newly-elected board to establish close contacts with the leaders of the independent Communists Parties of Lithuania and Estonia; and
—on the procedure for members of the Latvian territorial organization to transfer to the indepedent Communist Party.

At 1340 GMT Karlis Podnieks begins discussion of the draft rules, which have been distributed to the delegates. After the rules and necessary regulations are adopted at 1451 GMT, it is stated that the just-adopted rules and regulations cannot be fully observed; a provisional procedure is adopted for electing members of the independent Communist Party Central Committee, the board and the party chairman; and for the congress to elect 37 Central Committee members. Another 36 members are to be elected one from each rayon after the congress. There is a proposal to elect 41 members, not 37; it is adopted.

At 1505 GMT Cepanis says that he and Kezbers have been nominated for the party chairman's position, but he withdraws his candidature because of his workload. Kezbers says he wants other candidates so as to escape from "the old, bad procedure." The proposals are put to a vote. With only a few votes against, Kezbers remains the only candidate. There are not enough votes in support of a secret ballot. Thus, at 1511 GMT by an open ballot, with "a few" against, according to Cepanis, and 10 abstentions Ivars Kezbers is elected chairman of the independent Communist Party.

Kezbers delivers a brief speech of thanks and says that he is not ready to deliver a program speech; he says he does not like to rush things.

At 1514 GMT Aivars Kveps reads the proposed 41 central committee members.

At 1525 GMT a question of secret or open ballot to elect the Central Committee is raised. As 120 want a secret ballot, this is adopted.

At 1532 GMT reporter Tabuns ends the live coverage saying that what transpires during the remainder of the congress would be reported in newscasts.

### Independent Communist Party Program Noted

*LD1404174990 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1635 GMT 14 Apr 90*

[Report by TASS correspondents Valeriy Zaytsev and Galina Kuchina]

[Excerpt] Riga, 14 Apr (TASS)—The supporters of the idea of an independent Latvian Communist Party set up their own party this evening at an inaugural congress. Ivars Kezbers, formerly secretary of the Central Committee of the Latvian Communist Party, affiliated with the CPSU, and a USSR people's deputy, was elected chairman of the new party. He was the sole candidate.

The 579 delegates who gathered today in the main hall of Riga University, 90 percent of whom were Latvians, make up a third of the delegates who attended the 25th Latvian Communist Party Congress, which was held a week ago. They walked out of that congress, declaring their intention to cut their organizational links with the CPSU and set up an independent party.

The main principles in their program are withdrawal of the Latvian communists from the CPSU and the secession of the republic from the USSR. This program was rejected by the majority of delegates who attended the 25th congress and that was why the "independents" walked out. In spite of that walkout, the majority group in the Latvian Communist Party left the door open for the minority to return and reserved places for them in elected bodies, including the leadership of the Central Committee.

However, the minority formally endorsed the organizational split in the party today. [passage omitted]

### Latvian Doctors Refuse Reserve Service

*LD1504120490 Riga International Service in Latvian 1730 GMT 14 Apr 90*

[Text] The board of Latvia's Society of Doctors announced this week its decision on handing in the reservists' military service certificates of its members. Even a formal certificate belonging to the ranks of the USSR Armed Forces would be regarded as being in contradiction with the ethics of doctors. At the same time Latvia's Society of Doctors guarantees its participation in the event of natural calamities and disasters, and also in the possible formation of the home guard of the republic of Latvia. The doctors have been urged to make such a decision by the repressions carried out by the Soviet Army in Georgia and Azerbaijan and also by the present activity in Lithuania. Moreover, the Geneva international convention of 1949 regards as illegal the practice of calling up of citizens of an occupied country into the army of occupation. Approximately 1,000 persons have now given up their military service certificates in Latvia.

### Union Support Group Set Up in Latvia

*PM1504180590 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 14 Apr 90 First Edition p 6*

[Correspondent Lieutenant Colonel M. Ziyeminsh report under the rubric "Direct Line": "Latvia: Support for 'Union' Group"]

[Text] Riga, 13 Apr—It has been announced in the republic that 3 May has been scheduled as the start of the work of the First Supreme Soviet Session, which, it is no longer a secret to anyone, will be held in an exceptionally complex political situation. The communists of Daugavpils Sprocket Chain Plant have already publicly voiced their opinion of this. "We, the majority of whom

support the socialist choice and the renewal and development of the federation of the USSR," they state in an appeal to the republic's parliamentarians, "would like to rely on your wisdom and reason. We regard the 'Lithuanian option' as a road leading to an impasse."

These days groups of people's deputies, including such well known people in the republic as A. Rubiks, V. Alksnis, T. Zhdanok, and V. Stefanovich, have appealed to all people's deputies of the Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic to support the platform of the "Union" group, which has been formed by USSR people's deputies. It is proposed to create a unified republic group uniting people's deputies of all levels of soviets who adhere to the principles of preserving the USSR as a federation. It will be based on rayon and city organizations. It is planned to hold the constituent congress of the united republic group 22 April.

The People's Front appears to pursue different tasks and aims at the first session. Its duma has also appealed to newly elected Supreme Soviet and local soviet deputies, summoning them to a rally 21 April in order to "express their own viewpoint and that of their voters on our motherland's future" and to ensure that "the historic decisions which will be adopted at that session reflect the will of the people of Latvia as fully as possible."

### Latvian Communist Party Shuts Down Newspaper

*PM0904150990 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 7 Apr 90 First Edition p 5*

[Article by Lieutenant Colonel M. Ziyeminsh: "Newspaper Closed Down"]

[Text] The Latvian newspaper RIGAS BALSS ("Voice of Riga"), which has a circulation of 70,000 and is published in two languages—Latvian and Russian—has been closed down. It was an evening newspaper which had readers and subscribers not only in the republic's capital. The decision was made by Riga Latvian Communist Party Gorkom [City Party Committee] Bureau.

"Recently," the gorkom bureau resolution stated, "the RIGAS BALSS Editorial Office, ignoring decisions made by the bureau and the party gorkom plenum, has started openly opposing the CPSU's ideological and political line and systematically publishing defamatory and sometimes slanderous articles about the work of the gorkom, its leadership, and candidate people's deputies espousing the CPSU platform..."

For myself I can say that the evening newspaper has periodically featured items which directly or indirectly concern the lives or problems of today's Army. And, as a representative of a military organization, I cannot fail to take in that these items were often biased, sensationalist, or written without an in-depth understanding of the subject. I have written in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA about this.

I have to say something else too: RIGAS BALSS was considered an organ of the party gorkom and Riga Soviet. Recently there had been discussions about the possible option of splitting the newspaper and setting up two newspapers in its place: a Riga City party organization newspaper and a Riga City Soviet newspaper. But the search for a compromise solution has been delayed.

Since this decision was made on the eve of the Latvian Communist Party congress, some people are inclined to consider this fact to mark the start of the division of party property in connection with the incipient split in the republic's party organization.

## RSFSR

### RSFSR 'Democratic Russia' Holds Conference

*90UN1439A Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY in Russian No 14, 7-13 Apr 90 p 4*

[Correspondent report: "Conference of the 'Democratic Russia' Bloc"]

[Text] A conference of people's deputies of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] belonging to the "Democratic Russia" (DR) election bloc was held 31 April-1 March in Moscow.

At the start of the conference representatives of the regions delivered brief reports on the election results. It was observed that violations of the Election Act and attempts to discredit DR candidates had taken place in many constituencies. In particular, Leningrad, Deputy M. Salye observed, was "inundated" with leaflets calling for a boycott of the elections since it had become clear that the chances of the democratic candidates were preferred.

Almost all the deputies noted the activity of MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs] officials in the nomination and support of their own candidates. For example, 300 candidates from the MVD were nominated in Kuybyshev Oblast alone, Deputy V. Anokhin remarked.

Many of the speakers observed that fruitful work at the RSFSR Congress and in the Supreme Soviet was possible only given the consolidation of the supporters of "Democratic Russia." The deputies do not care for the role of opposition in the future Russian Parliament. But in order to win supporters it is essential to offer the wavering deputies a specific and effective action program both at the first congress and subsequently.

A number of commissions set to work during the conference even. They discussed the draft documents "Sovereignty of Russia," "Agenda of the Congress," "Standing Orders of the Congress," "Amendments to the RSFSR Constitution" and others.

Keen debate was evoked by two drafts of the final document. The author of one of them was N. Travkin, people's deputy of the USSR and RSFSR. Following

discussion and additional work on his "open letter" to the electorate and deputies of Russia, 106 deputies from various regions of Russia appended their signatures to it.

The letter said, inter alia, that the party-administrative apparatus was strong not by dint of ideas but organizational-structural associations. CPSU, VLKSM [All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League], AUCCTU [All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions] and sectoral ministry "blocs" were being formed. Similar structures are coming to be introduced in Russia also. This will not improve life in the republic. There will merely be an increase in the number of officials trying to persuade us that Russia is now independent and sovereign.

The "open letter" observes that the official authorities will adopt decisive measures only when the people "are wound up and have reached boiling point." Measures that only recently were viewed as "extremist" are becoming a part of official policy. These include, for example, the revocation of Article 6 of the USSR Constitution, the introduction of the institution of the presidency, and the more energetic transition to a market economy. "We are eternally late, and the Russian Parliament cannot permit itself to be so," the document says.

The deputies of Russia who signed the letter are for a market economy and manufacturers' competition for the benefit of man. But no economic measures should lower the living standard of needy citizens and persons on a fixed income. A policy of stepping up taxes is unacceptable. It is the "thieves, distributers and sated bureaucracy" who should lose out upon the transition to the market.

The document observes that the restored statehood and sovereignty of Russia presuppose the right of veto of any USSR law if it is contrary to the interests of our peoples.

The chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, the letter says, should be elected for a two-year term. This length of time would give him a push and prompt him to take decisive steps. It is essential to conduct national elections for the president of Russia after two years.

So work on preparation of the First RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies has begun both in the depths of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium apparatus and in the working group of the "Democratic Russia" bloc of deputies. Much will depend on what the agenda and standing orders of the congress are. And, what is most important, on who heads the Russian Parliament.

A meeting of RSFSR people's deputies of the "Democratic Russia" bloc will be held on 14 April at 1000 hours in Moscow.

The agenda:

1. Examination of the progress of preparation of the First Congress of People's Deputies of the RSFSR.

2. Establishment of an organizing committee.

It is proposed examining questions of the agenda and the standing orders of the First Congress of People's Deputies of the RSFSR, interethnic relations, and discussing possible candidacies for offices to be approved by the congress.

### Yeltsin Nominated Chairman

*LD1404170890 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 14 Apr 90*

[Text] A meeting of the Democratic Russia bloc of deputies is underway in Moscow today. Preparations for the first Congress of People's Deputies of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic are being discussed. Here is a report from our correspondent Vera Shchelkunova:

[Shchelkunova] First of all, what is the Democratic Russia bloc? It is a free association of people's deputies of the Russian Federation, who hold the view that Russia should further develop in a democratic way. I understand that I have used a euphemism here, and that this is too broad an interpretation, so I shall cite a number of theses from the draft political platform of the bloc. This states the priority of universal human values over narrow party interests; it states the need for deideologization of the economy and of public life. In general, these theses are somewhat declarative in character, it is true: for everybody knows what we want, but how is this to be attained? For instance, the draft resolution of the Democratic Russia bloc states the following: Conscious of our responsibility to the electorate, we will strive to deepen and accelerate the reforms under conditions of civil peace, and to bring about a real improvement in life, which tens of millions of people should feel in the very near future.

I must say that there was also quite a lot of sheer criticism, and negative comments, but constructive suggestions were also, encouragingly, voiced. These were included in the program of Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin, whom the Democratic Russia bloc decided to nominate for the post of chairman of the republican Supreme Soviet at the forthcoming Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies. Here are some of theses from his programme: a multiparty system, a market economy, introduction of a standard of living index, and index-linked pensions.

It is characteristic that Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin also proposed a system of guarantees against the risk of a regime of personal power.

The preparations for the Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies also include a multitude of aspects, which all the people's deputies are now considering. The members of the Democratic Russia bloc are also working on these problems. The meeting is continuing.

### Four Candidates Nominated

*LD1404205690 Moscow TASS in English 2027 GMT 14 Apr 90*

[By TASS Correspondent Lev Aksyonov]

[Text] Moscow April 14 TASS—Some 200 deputies to the Russian Parliament, united in the "Democratic Russia" bloc, nominated today Boris Yeltsin, people's deputy from the Russian Federation and member of the USSR Supreme Soviet, as a candidate to the post of chairman of the Supreme Soviet (Parliament) of the largest Soviet republic. Another four representatives of the bloc will be running for this post.

The First Russian Congress of People's Deputies will open in Moscow on May 16. It will elect the head of the republican parliament and the Supreme Soviet.

Ten candidates were nominated, but some of them refused to accept the nomination, including Russian and USSR Deputies Mikhail Bocharov and Nikolay Travkin, Russian Deputy and Chairman of the USSR State Committee for Environmental Protection Nikoaly Vorontsov and Moscow TV Journalist Aleksandr Tikhomirov.

There remained the candidates of People's Deputies Boris Yeltsin, Tatyana Koryagina, a Moscow economist, Vladimir Morokin, senior teacher of the Kazan Aircraft Building Institute, and Sergey Kovalev, a Moscow engineer, an associate of academician Andrey Sakharov who died late last year. One of the deputies, the Leningrad lawyer Yuriy Luchinskiy, put forward his candidature himself.

The candidates set forth their programmes and responded to questions of deputies. Some of them put forward only main propositions of their platforms.

The deputies who met today decided to find out the candidates' chances by the method of "soft voting": Each of them could vote as many times as was the number of candidates submitted for their consideration. Yeltsin got the greatest number of votes. He is followed in this original rating by Tatiana Karyagina. Luchinskiy is the third.

Members of the bloc taking part in the work of the organising committee told deputies about preparations for the First Russian Congress of People's Deputies.

## Deputies Interviewed

*LD1504192990 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 15 Apr 90*

[Text] The Moscow meeting of the Democratic Russian bloc of deputies was devoted to preparations for the first Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies. Vera Shchelkunova reports:

[Shchelkunova] Can you please say what in your view unites the deputies of the Democratic Russian bloc—what goals? What are you taking along with you to the Congress? Would you please give your name.

[Pudovkin] Deputy Pudovkin of Leningrad constituency No. 118. I think the main thing that unites us is the desire to change life in the in the Russian Federation for the better, and to change it by strictly peaceful democratic methods.

[Shchelkunova] And you, please?

[Aksyuchits] Viktor Aksyuchits, Moscow Profsoyuzyoy constituency No. 45. Deputies from a very wide political spectrum are represented in this bloc, from the Democratic Platform of the CPSU to members of the Kadet Party [Constitutional Democratic Party, originally instituted 1905-1917]. Or, for instance, the Christian Democratic Movement, of which I am one of the leaders. We are all united by a genuine striving towards radical reforms, and at the same time by peaceful means. We are all aware that the chief brake upon these reforms is the party nomenclature and apparatus. That is the case, whether we realize it or not. This, incidentally is Priest Gleb Yakunin, a deputy.

[Shchelkunova] Father Gleb, you are also in the Democratic Russia bloc. What drew you to this bloc?

[Yakunin] There are simply no other ways. This platform offers a realistic way out of the crisis. As we see, the experience of the USSR people's deputies in the interregional group indicates that they are unfortunately in the minority, and while we are using their ideas, we hope that our situation will be quite different: that we shall be able to embody the ideas of Democratic Russia in the real life of our Russia, our republic. Everything turns upon the fact that unfortunately the administrative bureaucratic apparatus which was in power is now once again aspiring to prolong or, properly speaking, to keep the levers of power in its hands. In the long term, we nevertheless have in mind that we should in our Russia, in our sovereign Russia, have our own president. This is first and foremost a question of power.

[Aksyushits] I would like to add here that to date, the Leningrad group of deputies, deputies of the North West, and Muscovites, have drawn up a whole series of very interesting proposals which I think should be put on the agenda of the First Congress of Deputies of Russia. The fact is the destiny of our republic will to a large degree depend upon what theses we adopt and what we decide at the first congress. What I am afraid of, and what I want to warn my comrade about, is that the apparatus does not let us drown the idea of the Congress of Deputies of Russia in interregional problems. [as heard] These are very important, but if we proceed along that road, then we shall not resolve the main, fundamental issue that affects the entire republic as a whole.

[Shchelkunova] What is the main, fundamental issue affecting the entire republic as a whole?

[Aksyushits] The status of the republic, a new union treaty, economic and political independence of the republic, the transfer to new methods of economic management, totally new principles of forming the central government and its competence, so to speak: that is, a whole series of major political, economic, and other

problems which will enable our republic to develop more intensively and on a fully democratic basis.

[Shchelkunova] Thank you. Excuse me, but what worries me most of all at present is that nevertheless there is a lack of good organization both in the political program and in the organizational principles proposed to the assembly. It seems to me that you are basically guided by negative aspects: namely, the apparatus is hindering things, something is impeding things, something must be opposed. But how is this to be done? One needs to be well- organized oneself to do that.

[Aksyshits] Undoubtedly. The situation in the republic is currently so catastrophic that all of us, regardless of the differences in platforms and views, should strive with all our strength to seek not only what separates us, but also what unites us. And all of us should begin our concrete ways of working first and foremost by consolidating our forces and efforts.

## First Round of RSFSR Elections Assessed

*PM1403123990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 14 Mar 90 Morning Edition p 7*

[G. Alimov report under the "Details for IZVESTIYA" rubric: "Second Round and Repeat Elections to Come"]

[Text] The results of the four-month election marathon in Russia have been summed up. Only 120 of the 1,068 deputies' seats in the all-Russian legislative assembly were filled as of 4 March.

To be precise, documents received from district electoral commissions show that 121 persons were elected. At its 12 March sitting, however, the Central Electoral Commission did not register one of them pending clarification of circumstances which have come to light and require further scrutiny.

Different appraisals of the results of the first round of voting are possible. Some people are stunned by them. On the other hand, people who carefully followed the course of the election campaign find that the results more than meet their expectations. Serious observers predicted that a majority of victors was unlikely to emerge before a second round of voting. The first round ended up being more or less a ranging exercise.

And so, what did the results of the 4 March elections indicate? There were 77.0 percent of voters taking part in the election. For the record: Voters' lists for the election of USSR [as published] people's deputies from territorial and national-territorial districts included the names of 103,089,178 persons. There were 900 territorial electoral districts and 168 national-territorial districts formed for the holding of elections. There were 5,447 candidate deputies running in territorial districts. The ballot papers listed a single candidate in each of 27 districts, two candidates in each of 67 districts, and three or more candidates in each of 806 districts.

Elections were recognized as valid in 899 electoral districts. People's deputies were elected in 104 of them. Runoff elections will be held, in compliance with Article 52 of the Law on Elections of RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] People's Deputies, in 766 districts where more than two candidates run and none was elected.

There were 29 electoral districts where two candidate deputies ran for election, neither won the required number of votes, and no deputy was elected. The district electoral commission in Norilskiy No. 210 Electoral District adjudged that the election was invalid—less than one-half of voters on the list took part. This means that repeat elections will be held in all these districts.

Deputies' seats in national-territorial districts were contested by 1,258 candidates. Ballot papers in each of six districts contained just a single candidate, eight districts listed two candidates each, and 154 districts had three or more candidates each. Elections were valid in all 168 districts. People's deputies were elected in 17 of them. But the Central Electoral Commission annulled the election results from Leningrad's No. 12 Northern National-Territorial District, where gross violations came to light concerning the processing of candidates' electoral documents. It was decided to hold new elections there. The district electoral commission, as hitherto composed, was disbanded as not meriting confidence. The election marathon will be run again in four other districts, with two candidates running in each and neither winning the required number of votes. Runoffs will be held in 147 national-territorial districts.

These are the results. Despite everything, these elections to Russia's legislative assembly are unprecedented in many regards. It would be no exaggeration to say that these were perhaps the most democratic elections in many decades. Let me recall a few points. From the very start, Russia firmly rejected the public organizations' ability to directly delegate deputies to the parliament. Enjoying the right to nominate their candidates, they fought the contest for deputies' seats on an equal footing with all others. Russia also rejected the "filter" principle—district electoral meetings. Nor was there any limit on the number of nominated candidates. On average, more than seven persons contested every seat in territorial and national-territorial districts. A far from insignificant role was also played by the rejection—in deed rather than just in words—of percentage quotas governing the number of candidates from among workers, kolkhoz members, and other population strata. Women's representation was lower than ever before, there were fewer than ever representatives of workers and kolkhoz members, the number of young people was amazingly small—these were the results of nominations. Whether this is good or bad is a different matter. The important element here, in my view, is a principle which voters had a real chance to apply.

## Russian Republican People's Party Established

*PM1504164590 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 12 Apr 90 Second Edition p 3*

[TASS report: "Russian Republican Party Established"]

[Text] Leningrad—A Russian Republican People's Party has been established at the party's constituent congress. "By means of constitutional reforms we will strive for the establishment of new state structures which will respect above all the forms of life and culture desired by the people," V. Antonov, chairman of the organizing committee and one of the leaders of the new social formation, said. The members of the new party favor a mixed economy. Proceeding from the historical traditions of Russian statehood they intend to uphold Russia's unity, sovereignty, and honor.

## Moscow Soviet Mayoral Elections Previewed

*LD1204180290 Moscow TASS in English 1447 GMT 12 Apr 90*

[By TASS correspondent Dmitriy Polunin]

[Text] Moscow April 12 TASS—The most numerous group "Democratic Russia" in the Moscow City Soviet (Council) nominated all-Union legislators Gavril Popov and Sergey Stankevich candidates for city mayor and deputy mayor, respectively.

The second largest group "Moscow" abiding by the platform of the Moscow city party committee has not nominated its candidates for the leading posts in the city soviet so far.

However, the names of Aleksey Bryachikhin, first secretary of one of Moscow's district party committees, and present Mayor Saykin are more often mentioned as possible candidates.

The election of mayor and deputy mayor as well as the executive committee of the Moscow Soviet is one of the most important items on the agenda of the first session of the new city council, which will open this Monday.

In interviews with journalists, would-be "city fathers" concur in one thing: too many problems piled up in the capital over many years. The city soviet which had no real powers in the past, often made decisions but could not achieve their execution.

Party functionary Bryachikhin intends, if he is elected, to buttress the rights and powers of the city authorities with a real mechanism for their implementation. In his opinion, it is necessary to establish a new structure for running the municipal economy, since the old one turned out to be inefficient.

Present Mayor Saykin believes it is necessary to concentrate on several priority areas, including housing, consumer goods supplies and city landscaping.

The task of the Democratic Russia Group is to make perestroyka laws adopted by the Soviet Parliament work at the local level, Stankevich told journalists.

In his opinion, the election of Moscow City leaders from among Democratic Russia deputies would enable Muscovites to feel, at long last, the difference between apparatus and democratic management.

Many believe that candidates from the Democratic Russia group uniting about 60 per cent of all Moscow Soviet deputies will win the high posts. But the results of the election will be known next week.

## Moscow Oblast Soviet Deputies Meet 10 Apr

*LD1004132990 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1000 GMT 10 Apr 90*

[Text] The deputies to the newly elected Moscow Oblast soviet have come together for their first session today. There are 25 items on the session agenda, proposed by the coordinating committees. These are primarily organizational matters. The deputies are to elect the standing commissions of the Moscow Oblast soviet and its chairman, and to form a presidium of the soviet and an executive committee. A total of 324 out of the 400 members of the corps of deputies from the Moscow area have been elected to date. The other places will be occupied by deputies elected in repeat elections on 22 April.

The heated debates that developed even in the first hours of the sessions' work give grounds for supposing that a single day will be too little in order to solve all the issues. Difficult debates lie ahead.

## Leningrad Oblast Elects Supsov Leaders

*LD1404201490 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 14 Apr 90*

[Excerpt] The first session of the Leningrad Oblast Soviet of People's Deputies has ended, and the new composition of the soviet has started work. Over to our correspondent Matvey Frolov.

[Frolov] The session seems to me to have been conducted in an organized and dynamic way. The new deputies, the overwhelming majority of whom have been elected for the first time, demonstrated their active approach and their commitment to improving the entire socio-economic situation in the oblast. I should like to draw your attention to one side of the session's activities, namely the formation of the leading organs. Deputy Yuriy Fedorovich Yarov, who was beforehand elected deputy of the republican Supreme Soviet, and who previously worked as chairman of the executive committee of the oblast soviet, was elected chairman of the soviet. Lev Alekseyevich Koykolaynin, previously first deputy chairman of the executive committee, was confirmed as chairman of the executive committee. [passage omitted]

### Smolensk Oblast Soviet Chairman Elected

*LD1204223790 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 12 Apr 90*

[Text] The results of the elections of the chairman of the Smolensk Oblast Soviet of People's Deputies became known today. At first none of the five candidates collected a sufficient number of votes.

The run-off election ballots included: Vlasenko, first secretary of the Smolensk Oblast Committee of the CPSU; and Mamontov, the chairman of the oblast trades council.

During the vote count it turned out that the deputies of the first session of the Smolensk Oblast soviet showed a preference for Leonid Vasilyevich Mamontov,. It is he who has been elected chairman of the oblast soviet. The session will continue its session tomorrow.

### Vologda Obkom first Secretary Released

*LD1204211290 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 12 Apr 90*

[Text] Today, there was a plenum of the Vologda Oblast party committee which examined an organizational question. In connection with the confirmation of Comrade Kuptsov as chief of a department of the CPSU Central Committee, he is released from his duties as first secretary of the Vologda Oblast party committee.

### New Tatar Supreme Soviet Chairman Elected

*LD1304030690 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0200 GMT 13 Apr 90*

[Text] In Kazan, the first session of the Tatar Supreme Soviet is at work. On the agenda today is the formation of the presidium of the republics's highest body of authority and the Council of Ministers.

(Shamiyev), first secretary of the Tatar party oblast committee, has been elected chairman of the republic's Supreme Soviet. The permanent commission of the Supreme Soviet has also been formed.

### Saykin Appointed RSFSR Deputy Premier

*LD1304203390 Moscow TASS in English 2018 GMT 13 Apr 90*

[Text] Moscow April 13 TASS—By a decree of the Presidium of the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet, Valeriy Saykin was today appointed deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Russian Federation. Until recently Saykin has been the mayor of Moscow.

### Komi ASSR Sets Up Trade Union Federation

*LD1404202790 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 14 Apr 90*

[Text] A republican federation of trade union organizations of Komi ASSR [Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic] has been formed. Last year's strikes by Vorkuta and Inta miners, when the trade unions found themselves on the sidelines of events, and were unable to exert any perceptible influence, were a very strong catalyst for this. The interunion conference of trade unions of Komi ASSR, which ended last night adopted a decision to set up a federation, TASS correspondent (Viktor Makarov) reports.

In heated discussions when delegations at times walked out of the hall and then came back, a statute on the federation of the trade union organizations was adopted. Its leading body, the council, headed by chairman (Tarlopov), has been elected. The main organizational principle of the federation is that of voluntary entry and free withdrawal of trade union formations, which enjoy equal rights and independence in their activity within it. The federation is called upon to represent and protect the interests of working people. Being part of the country's united trade union movement, it advocates active cooperation and close interaction with the trade unions of all union republics, both within the all- union center of trade unions, as well as on a bilateral basis. Independence of the trade union federation from the state bodies and economic bodies and from political and public organizations has been announced. It intends to build its relations with them on the basis of equality and partnership.

### Udmurt ASSR Supreme Soviet Session Held

#### Opposition Group Emerges

*LD1404133890 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1100 GMT 14 Apr 90*

[Text] In our bulletins we have been regularly reporting on sessions of the supreme soviets of union and autonomous republics. We now have information about the first session of the Udmurt Supreme Soviet. Yesterday, the deputies endorsed the agenda quite quickly. However, an extra item—the establishment of an independent newspaper, the organ of supreme state power in Udmurtiya—was added to the existing 15 questions, namely, standing orders, the election of he chairman of the supreme soviet, the appointment of the head of government, and additions and amendments to the autonomous republic's constitution. This is the first achievement scored by parliamentary deputies representing the public organization known as the Movement of Democracy. It is now clear that they make up a kind of opposition group. Still to come is the election of the chairman of the Supreme Soviet and the appointment of the head of government of the Udmurt Autonomous Republic. The report on the work of the session was supplied by our correspondent in Izhevsk, Feliks Simakov.

### Supreme Soviet Chairman Elected

*LD1504121890 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1000 GMT 15 Apr 90*

[Text] A session of the Supreme Soviet of the Udmurt ASSR [Autonomous Socialist Soviet Republic] has elected (Valentin Kuzmich Tubylov), director of the (Asanovskiy): state farm agricultural college as chairman of the supreme body of power of the autonomous republic by a majority vote. His program contains cardinal and realistic reforms in agriculture and vital reorganizations in all spheres of economic, social, and political life of the republic.

### Russian Christian Democrat Explains Positions

*LD1304094790 Moscow TASS in English 0906 GMT 13 Apr 90*

[By TASS correspondent Boris Zverev]

[Text] Moscow April 13 TASS—The leaders of the Russian Christian Democratic Movement (RCDM) which was founded several days ago, aim to assert the rules of Christian morality in the country's political life.

Gleb Anishchenko, a co-chairman of RCDM Council, told TASS that "the movement sees a chance to revive morality by returning to Orthodox Church prime sources."

He said that the movement also includes a political party which "naturally has the task of working for power and asserting Christian principles in the state." Its programme will be adopted at a congress in about six months time.

There is no need to be a believer to join the party, the leader of Christian democrats stressed. A party member should only support its Christian platform in political activities.

Anishchenko sees a way to the country's economic revitalisation in the political sphere.

"Until our economy is deideologised, any economic revival is out of question," he noted. (According to the movement's policy-making documents, the RCDM favours a transition to a decentralised multistructural economy with the equality of various forms of property, including private.)

Christian democrats speak about the need to build an economy which would combine the market with a high level of social protection of people. "We see a counterbalance to the inevitable drawbacks of a market system in Christian morality," Anishchenko said.

"We think it necessary to combine market and the feeling of Christian justice, competition and responsibility for the neighbour." He noted that a group of leading Soviet experts is drafting the movement's detailed economic programme.

According to Anishchenko, to achieve its aims, the movement is forming a group in the new parliament of the Russian Federation. (The RCDM Council includes three deputies to the Russian Federation's parliament: Priests Gleb Yakunin and Vyacheslav Polosin, and philosopher Viktor Axyuchits.)

Asked about the movement's membership, Anishchenko replied that there was no registration of members for the time being.

At the same time he believes that the movement can count on the population's support, which is corroborated by the results of the elections to the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation when Yakunin and Polosin won impressively over their rivals.

### Leningrad Procuracy Brings Charges on TV Case

*LD1304201290 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 13 Apr 90*

[Report attributed to USSR Procuracy]

[Text] Following the well-known events that occurred on 6 April at Leningrad television, the Leningrad Procuracy has instituted criminal proceedings on the basis of Article 200 of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Criminal Code, which envisages culpability for arbitrary actions that cause material harm. An investigation is underway.

### Moscow Paper Becomes Exclusive Party Organ

*LD1504133190 Moscow TASS in English 1322 GMT 15 Apr 90*

[Text] Moscow April 15 TASS—The Moscow City Communist Party Committee has decided to turn the MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA newspaper into an exclusively party organ. Until recently, the newspaper was published jointly by Moscow's party committee and city soviet.

The Moscow city soviet will be able to publish its own newspaper, using party publishing facilities, officials said.

Since it will take some time to found a new newspaper, the city party committee is prepared to discuss continuing publishing the VECHERNAYA MOSKVA newspaper jointly with the Moscow soviet, MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA reported today.

"The need to clearly define the status of MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA and EVCHERNAYA MOSKVA newspapers is dictated by the political situation and the separation of the functions of party and soviet bodies," the report said.

The decision was also prompted by the fact that several newly-elected deputies demand exclusive rights on some publications for the Moscow city soviet, it said.

### Transport Breakdown in Omsk Described

*LD1404051590 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 2330 GMT 13 Apr 90*

[Text] A critical situation has recently developed in Omsk regarding transport for its inhabitants. Many bus and trolley-bus routes have been cancelled in this city, where the population is nearly 1.2 million. Thousands of blue- and white-collar workers, pupils, and students cannot get to their places of work and study or return home. At some enterprises, production levels are down because of the disruption to morning shifts. A nervous situation has arisen.

The reason for the crisis is the complete breakdown of almost 80 main roads. Not only the winter snowy sharp drops in temperature have made themselves felt, but the main reason is the bad work of the communal and road services and the irresponsibility of the city and rayon soviets.

Such a situation, it would seem, should cause extreme measures to be taken, in the first place at city executive committee level, the need for which are already clear. In Omsk the first session of the city soviet has been going on for a week. There are endless discussions, many of which come down to mutual reproaches and pretensions. The problems today in the city have taken second place. An executive committee has not yet been formed and the leaders of sections and directorates have not been confirmed. Moreover, the appeal by the former chairman of the executive committee, Glebov, to tackle things more quickly, and also the statement in the local newspaper by the oblast trade union council, in which deputies are warned about the possibility of spontaneous and organized labor conflicts arising in Omsk, have been practically ignored.

In the meantime, more than 200 buses and dozens of taxis and trolley buses break down every day, falling into holes and pot-holes on the remaining roads and filling stations, which are covered in water and mud. On Friday, virtually the whole old composition of the city executive committee, refusing to work with an unprofessional soviet, resigned. They have been trying to form a new one for more than ten days now, and in the meantime the city is drowning in mud.

### Yaroslavl Farmers Threaten Strike Action

*PM1104101390 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 10 Apr 90 p 3*

[Own correspondent B. Svishchev report: "Strike Threatened"]

[Text] Yaroslavl, 9 Apr—A session of the oblast kolkhoz [collective farm] council has ended at the "Mikhaylovskoye" experimental show farm. The question of the creation of a union of agricultural workers [soyuz agrarnikov] was discussed, and representatives to its oblast council, delegates to Moscow, and an editorial commission to draft the necessary documents were elected. The main part of the session had been completed, and a conversation about farming matters on the eve of the sowing was in progress. At this point the trouble started. The farm leaders were indignant: Again they are being given commands and being advised what to do—but not a word about their needs! Where is the cement and the lumber? Where have almost all the bricks which are produced in the oblast gone? It is only now that the peasants have been allowed to ship them out, when they must pay for permission to use roads which are closed because they are impassable. And this is a new way of taxing the countryside... to the benefit of the city offices.

The oblispolkom [oblast soviet executive committee] and the oblast agricultural administration have dodged a fair solution to these matters. It turns out that there is no one to defend the peasants if they do not defend themselves. It was then that P.G. Penkin, chairman of the board of the Kutuzov kolkhoz in Gavrilov-Yamskiy Rayon, made his proposal to setting up a rural strike committee.

The debate was a stormy one; the decision to strike, to deprive the city of milk and other products is a gesture of despair rather than a demonstration of kolkhoz and sovkhoz [state farm] strength. And so it was decided to avoid strikes until all else fails. But those assembled elected a strike committee. Representatives of kolkhozes, sovkhozes, and the oblast committee of the agro-industrial complex workers' trade union became members. P.G. Penkin became the chairman of the strike committee.

## Western Republics

### Chernobyl Telethon Committee Seeks World Aid

*LD1304090490 Moscow TASS in English 0743 GMT 13 Apr 90*

[Text] New York April 13—Representatives of the Soviet public have called on the international community to step up aid to accelerate the recovery from the Chernobyl disaster.

Members of the Chernobyl telethon organising committee who arrived here spoke at a news conference in United Nations headquarters on Thursday. The telethon will be held in the Rossiya Hotel concert hall in Moscow on April 26, the fourth anniversary of the Chernobyl disaster, said former world chess champion Anatoliy Karpov, chairman of the telethon organising committee.

Soviet central television will broadcast it in full. Talks are also in progress with several tv companies in Europe, the United States and Japan to broadcast the telethon, at least partially, in other areas of the world.

The main aim of the 24-hour information and cultural programme is to call the attention of the public to Chernobyl's present problems and to supply viewers with objective information about the tragedy.

Another aim is to draw funds which could be used to overcome the consequences of the disaster.

Telethon participants will include leading politicians, scholars, film and theatre stars and other men of culture, Karpov continued. He noted that the organising committee received considerable aid from UNESCO.

Karpov expressed hope that other international organisations,including the U.N. Childen's Fund (UNICEF), would also be helpful. The organising committee has opened bank accounts to transfer money.

He added that, apart from cash donations, "we need modern medical equipment, above all to set up diagnostic centres. The work of our committee, set up at the initiative of the Soviet Peace Fund, will continue after the telethon".

Journalists showered news conference participants with questions showing that the international community is deeply worried over Chernobyl's destiny.

Sharing serious apprehensions concerning the possible long-term aftermaths of the disaster on the health of many people, Academician V.I. Goldanskiy suggested that an international research centre be set up in the area of Chernobyl.

This centre could study the long-term after effects of radiation on people and nature.

Members of the organising committee had meetings with U.N. Under- Secretary-general V.S. Safronchuk, U.N. Secretary-general's Chief de Cabinet Virendra Dayal and the leadership of the United States U.N. Association.

## New Kiev Obkom Secretary Elected

*LD0204165390 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1345 GMT 2 Apr 90*

[Text] Kiev, 2 Apr (TASS)—A plenum of the Kiev Oblast Committee [obkom] of the Ukrainian Communist Party was held here today to examine an organizational issue. In connection with his appointment as a member of the USSR Presidential Council, Grigoriy Revenko was released from his duties as first secretary of the Party oblast Committee.

Anatoliy Kikot, who previously worked as the second secretary of this same party oblast committee, was elected first secretary of the Kiev Oblast Committee of the Ukraine on a multicandidate basis.

## Stryy City, Party Committees Combine

*LD2403110990 Kiev in Ukrainian to Europe 1800 GMT 22 Mar 90*

[Text] Party members in Stryy have deemed that it is not expedient to have two party committees—a party city committee and a party rayon committee. At the recent joint plenum of these elective organs they formed a single committee and thereby considerably reduced the staff.

In the past, all questions connected with the leadership structure could only be decided at a level of republic Communist Party Central Committees. Now, taking into account present-day tasks and specific conditions, the party masses can themselves decide the structure of party organs and forms of their activities.

## Zhitomir Electorate Supports Alternative Candidates

*90UN1185B Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian No 11, 14 Mar 90 p 2*

[Article by L. Grafova: "They Expressed Their Will"]

[Text] **The elections in Zhitomir have taken place, and the results, although not yet final, showed the true will of the people.**

Exactly those candidates in the republic soviet whom local authorities and the press represented as "extremists" capable of starting "any bloody battle"—journalist A. Zayko, teacher A. Sugonyako, and economist V. Melnichuk (the first two are members of the CPSU, and during the election campaign it was decided to exclude both from the party for participating in rallies)—collected the greatest number of votes and are included in the list for repeat elections. Of 67 deputies who already have been elected to the city soviet, 34 were nominated by informal organizations; and of the 83 who have to go through a second round, 60 are "objectionable" candidates.

As far back as February of last year, a rally of 17,000 persons demanded the resignation of oblast and city leaders. It was only toward the end of the year that V.M. Kavun, first secretary of the obkom [oblast party committee], was put on pension, and in other elements it was not resignation that occurred but jockeying for position. A resolution was adopted this February at the same stadium not only about the resignation of the obkom but about the full transfer of authority to the soviets. Two facts were disclosed that exhausted the patience of Zhitomir residents. Upward distortions for meat in the sum of R6 million were exposed, upward distortions that remain unpunished, and, on the other hand, the former first secretary received his fifth Order of Lenin for the very same "meat plan." And a second fact: A storehouse of commodities in short supply, including imports, worth almost half a million rubles, was uncovered under the Preobrazhenskiy Cathedral. This is at a time when store shelves are empty!

In response to the demands of the rally, the authorities undertook countermeasures that are typical for our time—they began to incite the hysteria of fear through the press and radio: It seems that informal leaders are preparing a coup in the city and that "they are calling for bloodshed." A vehicle with a loudspeaker was driven

through the city streets, warning of an approaching apocalypse in the city of Zhitomir itself.

Due to the restraint of the tempered Zhitomir democracy, nothing extraordinary happened in the city. No, the authorities did not resign. But the people expressed their will at the ballot boxes.

### Religious Differences in Western Ukraine Noted

*LD1204125190 Moscow TASS in English 1048 GMT 12 Apr 90*

[Text] Moscow April 12 TASS—The Holy Synod of the Moscow patriarchate has expressed deep concern over the prospect of a crisis in relations with the Holy See as a result of the rejection by Ukrainian Greek Catholics (Uniates) of an understanding to settle their centuries-old dispute.

This is the gist of a statement by the Holy Synod, released today, concerning the broken-off talks between the Russian Orthodox and Roman Catholic churches, aimed at settling relations between Orthodox and Catholic believers in the Western Ukraine.

For this purpose a quadripartite commission consisting of representatives of the Holy See, the Moscow Patriarchate, the Ukrainian Orthodox Church and Catholics of an Eastern Rite worked in the Ukraine last March.

During the work, the commission adopted several decisions: The commission divided churches in the cities of Nesterov, Zolochev Nikolayev, Yavorev, Stryi and Borislav between Orthodox and Uniate believers.

Although one of two representatives of Catholics of an Eastern Rites, Archbishop Vladimir Sternyuk left the commission's meeting suddenly on the last day of its work, the Catholic side announced that the work would continue, since the other Catholic representative remained.

The commission adopted a statement on the results of the meeting on March 18 that church representatives would begin additional examination of outstanding issues.

On behalf of their churches, commission members promised not to attempt to seize churches by force.

However, the Lvov-based LENINSKAYA MOLODEZH newspaper carried a statement by the Episcopate of the Greek Catholic Church in the Ukraine concerning the talks, announcing the illegality of the documents approved by the commission.

Moreover, the statement alleged that the opinion "represented by hierarchs from the Ukraine was agreed with Pope John Paul II".

The Holy Synod of the Moscow patriarchate claims that this statement triggered an 'increased number of seizures of Orthodox churches accompanied by vilence and illegality".

The statement by the Holy synod says that, instead of observing laws and ensuring security of their citizens, local authorities are conniving at these actions.

"The most glaring evidence of this is a decision by the Lvov city Soviet (council) to transfer the St. George Cathedral and the archibishop's residence to Catholics of an Eastern Rite.

"Thus, Orthodox believers may be evicted on the eve of Easter."

Taking into account the above, the Holy synod again calls for stopping enmity between brethren in Christ and suggests that a just and legitimate road to the solution of the problem be found in the spirit of christian love".

The Moscow Patriarchate expresses hope that the Holy See "will pay attention to the present situation and prevent these events from influencing the development of these events from influencing the development of the Orthodox-Catholic dialogue".

The document quotes an official statement by the Vatican, saying that the Holy See is very satisfied with an agreement achieved by its envoys in cooperation with Orthodox representatives.

### 'Serious Differences' at Crimean Tartar Talks

*LD1304155990 Moscow World Service in Russian 0930 GMT 13 Apr 90*

[Text] At the second sitting of the state commission on the problems of the Crimean Tartar people, which took place in the Kremlin, serious differences have emerged between the leadership of the Ukraine and the representatives of that people, which were deported during the years of Stalin's rule.

According to a report from the independent INTERFAX agency, Valentin Popov, one of the leaders of the republic's state planning committee, stated that the time scale for the return of the Tartars to their historic homeland in the Crimea should be spread over 10 years.

That point of view was sharply criticized by representatives of the Crimean Tartars. As a result, the program for resolving the Crimean Tartar problem which had been proposed by the Ukrainian leadership at the sitting of the state commission was rejected.

### CP Secretariat on Moves Toward New Parties

*PM2603093790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Mar 90 Second Edition p 2*

[RATAU-TASS report: "At the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee Secretariat"]

[Text] The Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee Secretariat has examined the letter "To 'Rukh' [Ukrainian People's Movement for Perestroyka] Members and All Ukrainian Citizens," the "Appeal to Ukrainian Peasants, Workers, and Intelligentsia," and the

draft statutes for the Ukrainian Peasant Democratic Party published in the newspaper LITERATURNA UKRAINA, which attest to the intentions of certain groups to set up two new political parties in the Ukraine.

During the discussion it was stressed that at its latest plenums the CPSU stated its readiness to work under a multiparty system. And the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee has repeatedly reaffirmed the desire of the republic's communists for constructive cooperation with all political organizations which adopt socialist positions.

It was noted that under current conditions the creation of a party is a matter for various groups of people. There should not be parties and organizations which only sow enmity between people.

At the moment it is hard to say how the authors of the Ukrainian Peasant Democratic Party document envisage the party, even though they have stated that it will be socialist-oriented. As for the political orientation of the future "Rukh" party, it is clear from the LITERATURNA UKRAINA letter and from articles by "Rukh" leaders—not least in the foreign media—that its policy will be aimed against the federation and the union state and at a complete split between the Ukraine and the USSR.

The Central Committee Secretariat has appealed to all communists—workers, peasants, and intelligentsia—to above all be honest with themselves about where they stand at this difficult time for the party.

On the basis of the CPSU statutes' demands that people cannot be members of several political parties, the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee Secretariat has stated that those party members who signed the documents in LITERATURNA UKRAINA have placed themselves outside the CPSU.

## Rukh Leader Considers Quitting CPSU

*LD2403222690 Kiev in Ukrainian to Europe 1800 GMT 22 Mar 90*

[Text] Dmytro Pavlychko, one of the leaders of Rukh [Ukrainian People's Movement for Perestroyka], submitted today to the party committee of the Ukraine Writers Union a statement on his leaving the CPSU.

Dmytro Pavlychko, a well-known Ukrainian poet, joined the party in 1954. He is a member of the board of the Ukraine Writers Union and head of the Ukrainian Language Society. Last year he was elected a USSR people's deputy. Responding to Radio Kiev's request to comment his decision, Dmytro Pavlychko said:

[Begin Pavlychko recording] I consider that a qualitatively new period has begun in the life of our society. It is distinct in that a multiparty structure of society is taking shape. And I, as one of the founders of Rukh and as a person who has over the last few months given all his energy to the restructuring processes, consider that the creation of a new party in the Ukraine is the primary national necessity. In view of this, can I be a member of two parties at the same time? No, I cannot.

This does not mean that in the CPSU, which I am leaving, there are only people with whom I do not want to exchange even greetings. Not at all. My step is dictated by the need to separate myself from the old dogmas. I cannot say now what program the future party will adopt, but I believe it will reflect the things initiated by Rukh. [end recording]

## Ukraine Demands Removal of CP Organizations

*LD2503084590 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1626 GMT 24 Mar 90*

[Text] Kiev, 24 March (TASS)—Attempts have recently been made to remove party organizations from enterprises in some Ukraine oblasts. A TASS correspondent asked for a comment on these instances in the press centre of the Central Committee of the Ukrainian Communist Party.

It is true that in some labor collectives in Ivano-Frankovsk, Lvov, and certain other oblasts party organizations are being pressured to leave the enterprises. Under pressure from local leaders of "Rukh" [Ukrainian People's Movement for Perestroyka] and the Ukrainian Helsinki Union, demands for the removal of party organizations from industry have been included in the collective contracts at several enterprises in the town of Drogobych (Western Ukraine). This is being done in circumvention of the party organizations and despite the opinion of the majority of communists. Many workers are outraged by this. People are appealing to the local soviet bodies to determine the legality of the decisions being taken.

In accordance with the new wording of Article 51 of the USSR Constitution, citizens have the right to gather together in political parties and public organizations and to take part in mass movements which promote the development of political activity and of independent activity and the satisfaction of their diverse interests. Article 7 guarantees them the opportunity of performing the functions stipulated in their programs and rules. It is perfectly obvious that suspending the activities of primary communist organizations and committees at enterprises runs counter to the USSR Constitution. Similar guarantees are provided in the Constitution of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR].

In addition, Article 11 of the code of laws on labour in the Ukrainian SSR, which defines the content of the collective contract, does not provide for the suspension of the existence of primary Communist Party organizations and committees at enterprises.

The action being taken against party organizations can only be interpreted as encroachment on one of the most important constitutional rights of citizens: to gather together in public organizations.

It was stressed at the press centre of the Central Committee of the Ukrainian Communist Party that party committees will act resolutely against attempts to foist upon public opinion the view that party organizations must be removed from any sphere connected with people's practical activities, particularly from the sphere of work, which has always been the firm underpinning of the party.

### Ukraine Reactor Shut Down; No Contamination

*PM1504173590 Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 13 Apr 90 p 2*

[Report by RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA correspondent O. Grabovskiy: "On Events at the South Ukrainian AES"]

[Text] Nikolayev—Rumors of a major accident at the South Ukrainian AES [nuclear electric power station] have alarmed the population of southwestern oblasts of the Ukraine and Moldavia. Anxious callers are constantly telephoning the newspaper's bureau.

What happened? There was an emergency shutdown of the third reactor unit at 0850 hours on 1 April—they had discovered a crack and a leak of hydrogen in the water cooling system of the winding of the turbogenerator stator. This equipment had been manufactured by Leningrad's "Elektrosila" Power Industry Production Association. Under the leadership of one of its designers, G. Khutoretskiy, repair and regulating work was being carried out at that time in the third reactor unit—more accurately, in the system that supplies water to cool the winding of the turbogenerator stator.

The reactor unit was put back in operation at 0352 hours on 8 April. However, on 9 April it was once again halted because of malfunctions that had come to light.

The special commission formed by Nikolayev Oblast Soviet Executive Committee states: No radioactive contamination occurred at the AES itself or in Yuzhno-Ukrainsk, the power workers' settlement. Background radiation does not exceed the levels prior to the reactor unit's shutdown.

### Report on 2d-Round Elections in Belorussia

*LD3103114290 Moscow TASS in English 1056 GMT 31 Mar 90*

[By TASS correspondents Vladimir Bogdanov and Vladimir Glod]

[Text] Minsk March 31 TASS—Belorussia has completed an important stage of the election campaign: nomination and registration of candidates in those counties where the second round of elections will be held.

One or two contestants for a parliamentary seat ran in those counties, but all of them were voted down by the electorate. There are 18 counties of this kind in the republic.

The Central Electoral Commission in Belorussia set up only three weeks for the nomination of new candidates.

Despite forecasts of some people who predicted that voters would be less active in these counties, statistics show quite on the contrary: While there were only 34 nominees for 18 seats in the first round, the number has now increased to 61.

While in the first round the list of candidates was dominated by party and government officials of the district level, the number of doctors, lawyers and scholars has increased now. It includes well known professors, Philosopher Mikhail Slemnev and Biochemist Vladimir Grinevich.

New republican public organisations, including the Belorussian Ecological Union and the Belorussian Language Society, stepped up their activities in those constituencies. They put more their candidates on the list of nominees.

The fact that even the State Security Committee joined the election campaign, was a real sensation. It nominated five candidates.

Soviet Ambassador to Poland Vladimir Brovikov, the former chairman of the Belorussian Council of Ministers, also joined the electoral race. He has become known for his criticism of the Soviet leadership in the recent past.

The second round of elections ends on April 22.

### Lithuanian Belorussians Appeal to Authorities

*LD1404160890 Moscow TASS in English 1547 GMT 14 Apr 90*

[By TASS correspondent Aleksandr Kryzhaovskiy and Aleksandr Palchevskiy]

[Text] Minsk April 14 TASS—People carrying posters in their hands gathered this morning outside the government building in Minsk, capital of the republic of Belorussia. Inscriptions on the posters said: "Belorussians, our brothers, help us defend the future for our children," "We ask for political asylum in the Soviet Socialist Republic of Belorussia" and "Nationalism is a catastrophe for all nations."

Dozens of people from Vilnius and other Lithuanian cities and villages, mostly ethnic Belorussians, expressed in this way their deep concern over the development in that Baltic republic.

Participants in this action told TASS that intolerance with regard to the non-Lithuanian population was being kindled in the republic bordering on Belorussia. This manifests itself both in strongly intensified everyday nationalism and in speeches of representatives of various political groups and mass media, as well as in the language discrimination.

According to those who came to Minsk, the decision of the Lithuanian leadership to secede from the USSR runs counter to the intentions of many representatives of the Russian-speaking population. It would completely ruin their lives.

Vladimir Mikulich, chairman of the presidium of the Belorussian Supreme Soviet, received a delegation from Lithuania today. They handed in to him an appeal to the Belorussian people, letters and applications of Belorussians living in Lithuania, who asked to grant a political asylum to them and help them resolve problems involved in their resettlement from Lithuania.

### Moldavian Election Results Summarized

*LD3003181490 Kishinev Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 15 Mar 90*

[Text] A report from the Central Electoral Commission for the elections of people's deputies of the Moldavian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR]:

A routine session of the Central Electoral Commission for the elections of people's deputies of the Moldavian SSR has taken place. It examined the results of the elections of people's deputies of the republic and local soviets held on 10 March.

It was noted that 74.06 percent of the voters participated in the repeat ballots held in 237 constituencies, in the course of which 234 people's deputies of the Moldavian Soviet Socialist Republic were elected, 225 of whom have been registered by the Central Electoral Commission. In three constituencies the elections were deemed not to have taken place; in nine, the results of the voting are being defined more precisely and will be announced subsequently. Thus, the names of 365 people's deputies of the Moldavian SSR are already known, of whom 282 are white-collar workers, 65 collective farm workers, nine ordinary workers, four servicemen, four clergy, and one pensioner. Thirteen of them are women.

The national composition of the new parliament looks like this: 254 Moldavians, 56 Russians, 35 Ukrainians, 12 Gagauz, and eight Bulgarians. Members and candidate member of the CPSU account for 302 holders of deputies' mandates; one is a member of Komsomol [Leninist Communist Youth Leage].

The distinctive feature of the present election campaign was the fact that the overwhelming number of those elected by the people gained their victory in multicandidate ballots. They include Comrade Luchinskiy, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Moldavia, and Comrade Snegur, chairman of the presidium of the republic's Supreme Soviet.

Repeat ballots were also held in 539 constituencies in the elections for rayon soviets, 456 for town soviets, 195 for Kishinev Rayon soviets, 83 for settlement soviets of people's deputies, and 95 for rural soviets. The turnout was 63.51 percent. In voting for candidates for rayon soviet deputy turnout was 78.53 percent; for town soviets, 57.30 percent; for Kishinev Rayon soviets, 87.31 percent; for settlement soviets, 80.66 percent; and for rural soviets, 82.40 percent.

On 10 March a total of 1,199 deputies were elected, comprising 490 to rayon soviets, 390 to town soviets, 160 to Kishinev Rayon soviets, 71 to settlement soviets, and 88 to rural soviets. Those elected by the people include 133 workers and 88 collective farm workers. There are 237 women, 712 members and candidate members of the CPSU, and 26 Komsomol members. Some 989 of the winners were elected for the first time. The appropriate electoral commissions deemed the elections not to have taken place in 142 constituencies.

There will be repeat elections on 22 April for people's deputies of the Moldavian SSR in six constituencies and for deputies to local soviets of people's deputies of the Moldavian SSRj in 169 constituencies. According to the timetable, submission of candidates will last until 24 March and their registration from 25 March to 2 April. Candidates will meet voters from 3 to 21 April.

Appeals, complaints, and protests received at the Central Electoral Commission and other matters connected with the completion of the election campaign were also examined at the session.

### More on Election Results

*LD2203135490*

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 0900 GMT on 22 March carries a report from Kishinev by Valeriy Dragan on the elections recently held in Moldavia.

Dragan introduces Vladimir Konstantinovich Kiktenko, chairman of the republic's electoral commission center, to talk about election results. Kiktenko says the main work has been done, but there is still analysis work and repeat elections ahead. Repeat elections will take place in 10 electoral districts; 1,892 candidates competed for 380 mandates. On 25 February and 10 March, the first stage of elections, 370 deputies gained mandates; 96.5 percent of the elected have higher education; 77.8 percent are white-collar workers. In the past, about 30-40 percent of deputies were women, but now the percentage is far lower, 3.5 percent, he says.

Repeat elections will take place on the 22 April; 112 deputies out of the 370 are representatives of the Popular Front; Interfront won about the same number of deputies. Kiktenko says the elected deputies fairly accurately reflect the nationalities found in the republic—most are Moldavians, approximately 70 percent; Russians make up a little over 15 percent; about 10 percent are Ukrainians, Gagauz, Bulgarians, and so forth. The first session of the newly formed body will take place 17 April, he concludes.

### CPSU Gains in Parliament

*LD2303222690 Moscow TASS in English 1940 GMT 23 Mar 90*

[Text] Kishinev March 23 TASS—Communists won 83 per cent of seats in the Moldavian Supreme Soviet (parliament) in the recent elections. The Moldavian Communist Party chief, Petr Luchinsky, summing up the results of the elections in the pages of the Central Committee newspaper, expressed confidence that "the absolute majority of party members among the people's deputies is not a guarantee of unanimity in parliament."

According to the press, thirty to fifty per cent of communists who won the elections were supported by various public groups and movements, some of them opposing each other, as, for instance the Popular Front of Moldavia and the Yedinstvo (Unity) international movement.

The forthcoming session of the newly-elected Supreme Soviet in April is likely to be a difficult one. Many deputies will have to tone down their radicalism and reassess their own potential to see how well they can keep their pre-election promises, Luchinsky said.

The Communist Party must act now as a force restricting extreme manifestations of various public movements, he stressed. Its task is to unite people's efforts to contribute to perestroyka, begun by the party.

The Communist Party is now renouncing diktat, which it practiced earlier, as it has renounced constitutional guarantees of its leading role.

But this does not mean that another force exists in our society capable of suggesting practical alternatives, in deeds, not in words, to what the Communist Party proposes. This is the way it is in Moldavia, judging by the results of elections, he said.

### Moldavian Central Committee Holds Plenum

*LD2403191690 Moscow TASS in English 1625 GMT 24 Mar 90*

[Text] Kishinev March 24 TASS—A plenary meeting of the Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee was held in Kishinev today. The plenum discussed pressing tasks linked with preparations for the 27th Congress of the Moldavian Communist Party and the 28th Congress of the Soviet Communist Party.

The decision was taken on the procedure to elect delegates for the 28th Soviet Communist Party Congress. The republican party organization will be represented by 46 communists at the congress. All of them will be elected by direct ballot, with 26 of them in contested constituencies.

The plenum passed the decision on changes and amendments to the Constitution (basic law) of the Moldavian SSR and the status of Moldavia's Communist Party.

First Secretary of the Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee Pyotr Luchinsky made a speech at the plenum.

### Moscow TV Reports on Plenum

*LD2503084890 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 24 Mar 90*

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] As we have already reported, there was a plenum in Kishinev of the Central Committee of the [Moldavian] republican Communist Party. It discussed the programme for the renewal of the Communist Party of Moldavia.

[Begin recording] [Correspondent I. Petkov] That's a view of the plenum; and that's what it looked like outside the central committee building. [video shows rows of delegates seated; flag-waving crowd]

The republic's communists are to put forward their program for renewal at the forthcoming 17th Congress of the Communist Party of Moldavia. They are examining two alternative options for the structure of the party and the methods of its political activity. But they both agree on the main thing: the need to boos' the role, initiative, and responsibility of primary party organizations.

Renewal of the Communist Party of Moldavia, which is being discussed today, also presupposes the independence of the republican party organization.

[P.K. Luchinskiy, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Moldavia] It is natural that the main idea is the idea of the CPSU Central Committee's platform for the 28th congress; but all the issues which the Communist Party must express—the interests of the Moldavian people and the entire population of the republic—are reflected in this document.

[Petkov] At the start of your speech, your report, you reported that a decision had been taken today by the presidium of the republic's Supreme Soviet on the subject of the deterioration in the sociopolitical situation in Moldavia.

[Luchinskiy] Well, we did speak about this. It is unfortunate that of late some indefatigable young people have been spending the evenings disrupting traffic and so on. And, even though there have been no serious consequences of this so far, concern has nevertheless been expressed. We have picked up this concern, in particular by stepping up public order, above all in the capital of the republic. And we have said that communists and the primary party organizations should actively throw themselves into this process. [end recording]

## Kishinev Hunger Strikers Gain Officials' Attention

*PM2403185390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 24 Mar 90 Morning Edition p 2*

[Report by IZVESTIYA correspondent Eduard Kondratov under "Direct Line" rubric: "Attention Drawn to Hunger Strikers"]

[Text] Kishinev—The hunger strike being carried out by a group of people at the Stephen the Great Monument in downtown Kishinev continued Friday. Several other people have joined it.

The article published in IZVESTIYA (No. 81) under the title "But the Authorities Do Not Notice" brought an immediate reaction. V. Pushkash, first deputy chairman of the Moldavian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet Presidium, spoke on republic television yesterday [23 March]. He reported that a special commission had started work Wednesday [21 March]. The commission is composed of experts, lawyers, economists, and deputies who are carefully examining the case of each participant in the hunger strike. So, what the newspaper says is untrue—the authorities have noticed the hunger strikers.

True, the hunger strike participants themselves did not notice this. The brief appearance of two or three officials by their benches was unable to subdue their mounting anger. However, it's an ill wind that blows no good: In taking offense at the newspaper on television, the representatives of authoritiy did—albeit now belatedly—explain publicly to people that their complaints are being carefully examined. Maybe even more important is the fact that this is now known by those people who during the day crowd by the monument and in the evening organize noisy demonstrations in Kishinev's main street, halting the traffic...

Undoubtedly some people very much want to provoke disturbances in order to discredit the present leaders of the republic on the eve of the first session of the new Moldavian parliament. The group of hunger strikers in the city center is still a trump card in the political game being played by those forces. That is why this focus of public agitation should be quickly extinguished.

A meeting was held Friday [23 March] at the Moldavian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium building between participants in the hunger strike and M. Snegur, chairman of the Supreme Soviet Presidium; P. Paskar, chairman of the Moldavian SSR Council of Ministers; and P. Luchinskiy, first secretary of the Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee. This confidential discussion lasted more than 2 hours. It would seem that the hunger strikers have finally achieved their aim: Attention is now being paid to them and each case is being examined individually. However, not everyone, alas, has accepted the suggestion that they stop their hunger strike and move to a hotel until the commission finishes its work...

## Moldavia's Sociopolitical Situation 'Deteriorating'

*PM0204150590 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 31 Mar 90 p 4*

[Article by KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA correspondent A. Khantsevich: "Moldavia: Week's Events"]

[Text] A recent issue of the republic newspaper MOLODEZH MOLDAVIYI was published with a striking blank space. The editorial office informed its readers that it had been planned to carry there an interview that I. Khadyrke, chairman of the republic People's Front and USSR people's deputy, had given to APN journalists. At the last moment Khadyrke resolutely opposed its publication.

What did the unpublished item have to say? For the most part it contained sober, well-considered ideas on the need to consolidate social forces, on the desire for civil peace, and the fact that only myopic people could seek reunification with Romania at this moment... So has the position of the People's Front and its chairman changed during this time. Or have the actual political conditions in the republic changed?

An answer to these questions is supplied to some extent by the following events. A Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee plenum was held last week to examine the Moldavian Communist Party platform for its 17th congress. An alternative version of the platform which envisaged more radical transformations of the republic's ruling party was also put forward alongside the basic platform. But it did not receive the support of the plenum participants. Whereupon Moldavian People's Front Chairman Khadyrke announced his resignation from the Moldavian Communist Party.

Power was apparently also the main issue at the first session of Kishinev City Soviet, which is still completely unable to start normal work.

But meanwhile the situation is being heated up by a number of actions—unsanctioned processions, traffic obstructions, and the picketing of government buildings. None of the public movements accepts responsibility for organizing such events; however, they were repeated several times over last week.

The public hunger strike in downtown Kishinev has also heated passions.

These and other incidents have forced the Moldavian Supreme Soviet Presidium to adopt a resolution "On the Deteriorating Sociopolitical Situation in the Republic."

## Situation in Kishinev Returning to 'Normal'

*LD3003180590 Moscow World Service in Russia 0930 GMT 30 Mar 90*

[Text] According to reports from Kishinev, the situation in the capital of Moldavia is returning to normal. This is

being facilitated by the strict warnings to destructive forces given a few days ago by the Moldavia Supreme Soviet Presidium.

However, despite the measures that are being taken, some people are continuing a hunger strike in the center of the city under nationalist slogans. Paint has been poured over the statue of the great Russian poet Aleksandr Pushkin, who devoted many poems to Moldavia.

The Central Committee of the republican Communist Party is calling on the working people to consolidate to give a rebuff to nationalism.

## Caucasus

### Reportage on Incident at Yerevan KGB Office

#### KGB Official Describes Action

*LD1604070690 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0500 GMT 16 Apr 90*

[Excerpts] [Anouncer] Today the newspaper PRAVDA has published an alrming TASS report. It is headlined: "In the USSR Committee for State Security [KGB]." In it, it says that a meeting, organized in Yerevan by the Armenian National Movement on 14 April and dealing with, as it was announced, ecological problems, ended with a provocative call for the elimination of the KGB of the republic. [pasage omitted]

In order to find out what the situation is like just now in Yerevan, how this all happened, what occured, I have contacted our Yerevan correspondent, (Karun Ukhomaryanov). Can you hear us, Yerevan?

[(Ukhomaryanov)] Yes, of course.

[Announcer] Tell us, does the summary of the TASS report correspond to your information?

[(Ukhomaryanov)] Unfortunately, everything in the TASS report corresponds to reality, and it is doubtful that it requires any commentary. However, I would not like to see the presence of the Armenian National Movement or any other public organization in the republic in everything that happened. But, although not stated directly in the TASS report, this thought is discernable, at least in that fragment which you have just quoted, where it is said that the meeting devoted to ecology problems ended with a provocative call for the elimination of the KGB. I was at the meeting, and I admit that I did not observe any call for violence or pogroms. It is a different matter that in such a tense situation, which has existed for almost two and half years in the republic, we all, including, and maybe even to a greater degree, leaders of public movements, cannot be careful and responsible enough regarding what we say.

However, at the moment I have with me in the studio an official of the Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic KGB, (Georgiy Aramovich Sokisyants). He was an immediate witness of all of Saturday's events.

[(Sokisyants)] It is true that there was no open call at the meeting to hold a pogrom outside the KGB building. However, the last speech expressed, incidentally totally unrelated to the meeting's theme, an extremely negative appraisal of the KGB. This appraisal was seized upon, a call went up among the people, and off they went.

[(Ukhomaryanov)] Georgiy Aramovich, don't you know who made such a call? Is there no information on this?

[(Sokisyants)] It is being looked into. Of course, the negative attitude toward the KGB on the part of some people, on the whole, comes from the fact that in the past there were many deformations in the KGB's work, which have been talked about completely difinitively and openly at all levels, including by the KGB leadership. I will not dwell on these issues, because they are generally well known. But at the same time it must be noted that there is a certain significance in the fact that many do not have a sufficient idea of our present work. In this I also envisage our shortcomings, I mean the shortcomings of both of us. Today even more openness is necessary, and then careless, and even deliberately bandied, words will not find fertile soil in another situation.

This is particularly true of our republic and our people, who have experienced for more than two years such suffering, when spiritual pain is felt physically. But we understand this well. It was totally clear that among those who gathered outside the KGB building, the vast majority had absolutely no part in the attack.

Moreover, among the attackers certain people who are well known to the bodies of law and order were recognized. I must immediately make the proviso that they have any relation to it. Our Chairman Badamyants, Valeriy Georgiyevich, spoke perfectly clearly a few days ago in an appeal to the republic's citizens about the criminal elements camoflaging themselves in public patriotic movements. Of course, our principle attitude toward them is in complete accordance with the law. [passage omitted]

#### Armenian KGB Issues Statement

*NC1604073290 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 1630 GMT 15 Apr 90*

[Statement by the Armenian Committee for State Security—place and date not given]

[Text] The law enforcement bodies detained the four participants in the January 1990 bandit attack on the Yerevan border guards weapons depot. A statement on reasons for their detention was published in the press, in an issue that reports the involvement of criminal groups engaged in arms seizure with other groups subservient to irresponsible persons. After the attack on the weapons depot, the group of criminals armed with automatic weapons tried to hamper the work of the inspection team of the Committee for State Security, which was getting

ready to search the home of one of the detained organizers of the January bandit attack. Information about this criminal act was also reported on republican television. Later, the representative of the Committee for State Security received an ultimatum to release the detainees. Otherwise, there would be an armed attack on the Committee building.

All of this confirms that the criminal world is openly challenging the law enforcement bodies who are defending the interests and security of the Armenian people.

The 14 April meeting, organized by the Armenian Pan National Movement and devoted to ecological problems, ended with seditious calls for the elimination of the republic's Committee for State Security. In the absence of a counterargument from the organizers of the meeting, a substantial number of people, basically young men, went to Nalbandyan Street. They began to throw stones at the windows of the Committee for State Security and then to toss in lighted torches. The organizers of this action were massed in fornt of the doors of the building and tried to force their way in. According to information received, the extremists in the crowd started to urge prudence.

The representative of the leadership of the republic's Committee for State Security spoke to the crowd through a loudspeaker and explained the illegality of their action. He advised them to end the disorders and warned that if they broke into the building the committee personnel would have to use the forces and the means in their possesion to protect the military installation. A suggestion was made to negotiate, but it was turned down by the organizers of the disorders. Instead, they continued to incite the people to assault the building. Provocateurs, whose criminal past is known to the law enforcement bodies, were in the crowd. Three incendiary charges were thrown from the crowd, causing pockets of fire, and flares were set off. A teenager in the crowd was holding a homemade device which exploded and blew up his wrist. The militia workers took him to hospital where the young man died. A girl next to him was left in a state of shock.

The seditious disorders committed by the extremists lasted for almost two hours, resulting in serious material damage to the committee building and supplies. After many warnings and hearing the sound of gunfire broadcast as a follow-up measure, a substantial part of the crowd dispersed. However, a few individuals, who had previously participated in the attacks on the Soviet Army and militia installations to seize arms, continued their extremist, unrestrained actions.

The personnel of the committee was in full combat preparedness to repel the attack. However, they were aware that many curious onlookers were interspersed with the obvious criminal attackers, and could have become the innocent victims of the organized provocation.

In this exceedingly complex situation, the workers of the Committee for State Security displayed admirable restraint, composure, and organization. No arms were used. The restraint the KGB workers exercised prevented possibly tragic consequences.

The Committee for State Security, in informing the citizens of the republic of this episode, calls on everyone to be aware of the particular peril of the criminal world's provocative acts disguised as public and patriotic movements. It is time to realize that those who instigate for this kind of climate are pushing the people to a point beyond which they calculate the blood of innocent people must be shed.

The republic's Committee on State Security declares that such actions will be resolutely checked in accordance with the existing legislation and the rights granted to the law enforcement bodies.

A criminal proceeding has been instituted in connection with the mass disturbances. An investigation is being held.

## TASS Report

*LD1504194390 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1610 GMT 15 Apr 90*

[Text] Moscow 15 Apr (TASS)—An ecology meeting, organized in Yerevan on 14 April by the Armenian Pan National Movement ended with a provocative call for "elimination" of the republican Committee for State Security [KGB]. The grounds for this were the arrest of four participants of a bandit attack on a weapons depot of the border troops in January. Having met no resistance on the part of the meeting's organizers, a considerable group of mainly young people made their way toward the KGB building and began throwing stones and lit torches at its windows. Numerous attempts were made to break into the building. Incendiary charges were thrown from the crowd causing pockets of fire, and flares were set off.

One of the attackers in the thick of the crowd had a home-made device which exploded leaving him mortally wounded. He died in a hospital. A girl who was alongside him was left in a state of shock by the explosion.

The disorders instigated by the extremists continued for about two hours. Considerable material damage was caused as a result of the pogrom but the attackers were unable to penetrate the official premises.

All this time the committee's staff were on full combat alert, ready to repel an attack. They had sufficient forces and weapons to do this. However, the security officers realized that there were many people who just chanced to be among those who had congregated and who could end up innocent victims of a planned provocation. In an exceptionally complicated situation of the utmost tenseness, KGB officers diplayed composure and coolheadedness. Arms were not used. The composure of the security men averted potentially tragic consequences.

The Armenian State Security Committee has made a statement to citizens of the republic calling on everyone to recognize the special danger of provocative actions by criminals disguised as activists of public patriotic movement. The statement also stresses that such criminals are deliberately pushing [This and following additions and variations are reported in Moscow PRAVDA in Russian on 16 April: "also stresses that provocative elements from these circles are deliberately pushing..."] people toward a point beyond which they calculate that innocent blood must be shed.

The Republican KGB stated that such outbursts may be decisively stopped, [PRAVDA reads: "...that such outrages will be resolutely stopped, in strict..."] in strict accordance with existing legislation and the rights granted to the law enforcement bodies.

A criminal case has been brought in connection with the mass disorders on 14 April. An investigation is under way.

KGB Chairman V.A. Krychukov has sent a message to the entire staff of the State Security organs of Armenia which says; "The USSR KGB was filled with profound indignation on receiving reports from Yerevan on the bandit attack carried out on 14 April by extremist elements against the republic's KGB and its officers. As a result, the lives of many KGB men and townspeople were placed in danger. The excuse of this incident—unprecedented for civilized society—was the quite legitimate action of Armenian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] KGB officers to disarm a band of armed guerrillas who had committed terrible crimes on the territory of the republic. Arms and ammunition previously seized by the bandits following an armed attack on a troop unit were taken from them.

"What has happened has shown once again all the cynicism and hypocrisy of those behind this action who make themselves out to be 'champions of democracy and of defending the interest of the people'".

"We rate highly the determination and courage demonstrated by the Armenian security officers in warding off the attack on the committee's building. It is only thanks to the composure they showed and to their skillful actions that there were not worse consequences and more casualties. All the leaders and operatives acted correctly in this exceptional situation and showed that they will continue unhesitatingly to carry out their constitutional and civil duty with dignity.

"Unfortuantely, of late threats and illegal actions aimed at certain state security bodies have become more than mere isolated incidents, and if the USSR KGB has shown restraint in its public reactions, then it is only to avoid a greater exacerbation of the situation and to avoid giving the extremists an excuse to perpetrate fresh audacious acts that violate public order.

"Such actions by destructive elements do serious harm to the process of renewing society, put people's lives in danger and destabilize the situation. Security officers will show restraint in continuing resolutely to put a stop to provocative actions by forces which act against the law.

"For its part, the USSR KGB is doing everything necessary to ensure [PRAVDA reads: "...the USSR KGB will do everything necessary to..."] that the criminal case brought in connection with the disorders committed at the Armenian KGB building is thoroughly investigated within the shortest possible time, and that those guilty are punished with the full weight of the law. The USSR KGB has taken urgent measures to assist the Armenian KGB officers in carrying out their duty."

### Fatality Reported

*LD1504171490 Moscow TASS in English 1705 GMT 15 Apr 90*

[All quotation marks as received]

[Text] Moscow April 15 TASS—An ecology meeting, organised by the Armenian National Movement in Yerevan on Saturday [14 April], ended with provocative appeals to liquidate the Armenian Committee of State Security (KGB).

The appeals were made on behalf of four people arrested by KGB forces for their involvement in an attack against a border guard weapons depot in January.

As the rally organisers failed to denounce the appeals, a group of people, mainly youngsters, approached the KGB building, pelted it with stones, flares and lighted torches and attempted to break into the building.

One of the attackers was carrying a homemade bomb which blew up and mortally wounded the man, who died on arrival at the clinic, and severely shocking a girl next to him.

The outrage continued for nearly two hours, but the crowds did not manage to break into the building. The personnel were ready to rebuff the attack but they kept cool heads and did not use their weapons.

The Armenian Committee of State Security issued an appeal to citizens of Armenia calling upon them to raise the awareness of the special danger posed by provocative actions by criminals disguised as activists of public patriotic movements and stressing that criminals were intentionally pushing people towards the edge beyond which, according to their schemes, innocent blood would flow.

Criminal proceedings have been instituted to investigate the facts.

Soviet KGB Chairman Vladimir Kryuchkov noted in his address to the Armenian KGB forces that "the event exposed once again the cynicism and hypocrisy of those who instigated this action, those who seek to be taken as "champions of democracy and protectors of the people's interests".

"Such actions by destructive elements," the address says, "do much harm to the process of societal renewal, threaten people's lives and destabilise the situation. KGB members, while displaying restraint, will nevertheless resolutely put an end to acts of provocation by forces opposing law and order".

Kryuchkov assured the people that the Soviet Committee of State Security would take all necessary steps to promptly and comprehensively investigate the criminal case and bring those guilty to account in accordance with the law".

### Emergency Declaration in Armenia Considered

*AU1304143090 Paris AFP in English 1318 GMT 13 Apr 90*

[Text] Moscow, April 13 (AFP)—Soviet officials are considering declaring a state of emergency in the Armenian region of Megri, where Armenian nationalists are blockading the Azeri enclave of Nakhichevan.

The Radio Moscow news digest INTERFAX said Friday that officials from Nakhichevan, Moscow and Armenia had met in Moscow recently to discuss ways of ending the economic blockade on Nakhichevan. At the meeting, Armenian militants were accused of 68 acts of sabotage in the southern region of Megri, bordering Nakhichevan, against trains bound from Azerbaijan to Nakhichevan, which have to pass through Armenian territory.

Predominantly Christian Armenia has been at loggerheads with mainly Moslem Azerbaijan for two years over Armenian demands for the Armenian enclave of Nagorno-Karabakh to be transferred from Azerbaijan to Armenia. In January the tension erupted into virtual civil war between the two neighbouring southern Soviet republics.

A five-kilometre (three-mile) stretch of railway is already under army control in Megri. Nonresidents are barred from entering the area, and the army will now guard trains. Nakhichevan is separated from Azerbaijan by Armenian territory.

Armenian officials at the meeting opposed moves to declare a state of emergency in Megri.

### 5 Servicemen Released; Weapons Still Missing

*PM1504175590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Apr 90 Second Edition p 5*

[TASS report: "Soldier Hostages Released"]

[Text] As already reported, five internal troop servicemen were taken hostage 12 April in the settlement of Aygepard in the Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic's Shamshadinskiy Rayon. A troop task force headed by Major General Yu. Balakhonov was at once sent to the scene of the incident. The population of the adjoining rayons was notified by radio of the measures being taken to find the servicemen.

As a result of the operational and troop search measures, in which local soviet and party organs actively joined, the servicemen were discovered during the night of 13 April and returned to their subunit. Their weapons and ammunition have not been found.

### Railway Blockade of Armenia Causing 'Harm'

*LD1604100690 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0800 GMT 16 Apr 90*

[Text] [Announcer] Armenian-Azerbaijan's railway blockade is doing irreparable harm not only to the economy of the republic but also to the whole country. Our correspondent Koryun Khumaryan reports:

[Begin recording] [Khumaryan] Slightly more than 100 days have passed since the beginning of the new year. Armenia has spent 60 of these in a blockade, which is still continuing. Between July last year and now over 112,000 railway cars have failed to reach the republic along the Azerbaijan railway line. These cars would have brought about 6 million tonnes of national economic freight, mainly building materials for the earthquake zone and raw materials which, after processing here, would have been returned to various regions of the country in the form of machine tools, electrical machinery, and consumer goods. Now, of course, the consumer won't receive these goods.

They will not receive goods in exchange for the raw materials and components on board the 180 goods trains, which are now stranded without locomotives throughout the country's railway network. According to the Yerevan division of the Transcaucasus railway, 42 of these trains are stranded on the Armenian railway.

As a result of a shortage of raw materials and components, many very big industrial enterprises in Yerevan have either suspended work completely or are working at half-capacity. These include giants like the Lenin electrical engineering works, the (Yerakhs) motor works, and the Yerevan tire works. The Yerevan aluminium works has also completely suspended its work. I interviewed (Sergey Sherkinyan), deputy director of the plant:

[(Sherkinyan)] For example, our factories deliver their products to all the enterprises of the agro-industrial complex, from Sakhalin to the south. Every day I am receiving no less than 50 telegrams from different enterprises complaining about the delivery of aluminium foil for the packaging of butter, cheese, curds, and numerous food products of various kinds. Food processing enterprises in the Ukrainian Socialist Soviet Republic, the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, and other Union republics, which are bursting at the seams with produce, are forced to stand idle.

[Khumaryan] What's more, the shortage of rolling stock in the Yerevan division of the railway has reached 1,100 railway cars. In order to keep traffic and freight moving

within the republic, it has been decided to prohibit the loading of railway cars for destinations outside Armenia. [end recording]

### Details on Nairit Chemical Leak Reported

*NC1504080890 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 1630 GMT 14 Apr 90*

[Text] A liquid containing chloroprene was released into the atmosphere from the liquid chemical materials storage unit at the rubber production sector of the Nairit Scientific-Production Association at 0745 [0245 GMT] on 14 April 1990.

Measures taken by the supervisory personnel prevented any production mishaps. An on-site inspection and chemical analysis revealed that after the enforced closure of the Nairit Scientific-Production Association last December some water and chloroprene mixture had remained in the retrievable chloroprene storage units. This mixture had to be purified by a double reprocessing. According to the procedures, its preservation and reprocessing had to be done in a free atmosphere at a constant freezing temperature of up to 15 degrees Celsius.

However, reprocessing became impossible when the energy resources and catalytic materials needed by the chemists were unavailable because picketers have been blocking the railways leading to Nairit since 23 December. Thus, the procedures for storing retrievable chloroprene had been violated. Under the existing condition, it was decided to stabilize the mixture by the use [words indistinct].

In order to prevent accidents, many times the association had raised the question of prohibiting picketing of the railways used to export the manufactured goods stocked at the stores and to import materials and raw materials to purify the half-finished goods and the waste. However, the picketing is continuing.

Under the circumstances, the mixture at the storage units were constantly controlled. However, the onset of warm weather resulted in the increase of pressure, which caused fractionation.

According to the pertinent bodies, the released mixtures do not pose a danger to human beings.

### Armenian KGB Chief Discusses Activities

*90US0741A Yerevan KOMMUNIST in Russian 12 Mar 90 p 3*

[Interview with Major General V.G. Badamyants, chairman of the Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic Committee for State Security, USSR people's deputy, and candidate member of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau, by correspondents from TASS and the Armenian Press Agency; place, date of interview not given: "Not Secret at All"]

[Text] [KOMMUNIST] Valeriy Georgiyevich, we would like to begin our conversation with a topic that is extremely disturbing to the overwhelming majority of people: organized crime. As we know, the government has established the Committee on Fighting Crime, of which you have been selected as a member. What role is being played by the Armenian KGB in the struggle against this social evil?

[Badamyants] As the legislators have decided, KGB organs participate—and I emphasize, participate—in the work of the committee. The major brunt of this effort lies with the MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs] and procuracy. The KGB has focused on coordinating the joint effort and rendering necessary assistance to law enforcement organs. We also assist them in the conduct of operational investigations.

A considerable amount of work experience has already been accumulated which will enable us to make substantial corrections in our program of measures. I intended to speak on this matter in the USSR Congress of People's Deputies. I was unable to do so, unfortunately, but did submit the text of my address to the Presidium—it deals with the fact that we are faced with a long and sustained struggle. I am convinced that this struggle must be headed on republic level as well by a permanent—not temporary—coordinating committee of the Supreme Soviet, to which all, especially the law enforcement organs, are accountable.

Taking into account the present situation in our region, we cannot help but pay attention to the international—if we can express it this way—nature of criminal associations. As our experience has shown, national borders do not apply to them. In spite of the interethnic complications, criminal clan ringleaders establish common monetary funds and arbitration tribunals; they conduct interregional gatherings to chart a unified strategy and tactics.

We are entirely justified today in referring to their involvement in exacerbating interethnic conflicts, in stirring up extremism and aggressive acts committed with the help of bribed officials, hired thugs, and "activists" blinded by nationalistic fanaticism. This is why I believe many self-appointed informal organizations, especially now that the criminal world has armed itself to the teeth, should reexamine their personnel ranks and their funds so as not to be compromised by ties with criminals.

According to mafia law, the worse things are, the better it is for corrupt elements. They like to fish in troubled waters. And it is always the honest but deceived people who have to pay for it—those who have a problem living from paycheck to paycheck. Consider strikes, for example. Experience has shown that the simple people are powerless when efforts begin to violently coerce them into such actions. We adopted a resolution on strikes, but as of today it is not effective. Could the reason be that it does not provide measures for holding accountable those who take matters to the point of a strike? Here

I am referring to leaders of various ranks who avoid resolving people's pressing problems and to people who whisper, inspire, and organize illegal actions. Imperfections in our legislation enable them to evade responsibility, insofar as they themselves are not participating in the actions and in practical terms are not committing criminal activity.

[KOMMUNIST] But it cannot be a secret that the ringleaders do not personally engage in murder or theft, can it? How long will they be outside the reach of the law?

[Badamyants] Why do we begin to have doubts when it is proposed that we introduce into law the concept of "criminal association" and strict accountability for participation in such, as has long been the case in foreign countries? Why do we not only fail to accept as evidence materials obtained through operational investigations, including tape recordings, but even create all kinds of speculative insinuations around this? Why do we ponder over a law "on the chief witness," which will either free from responsibility entirely or reduce the level of punishment for people who assist in eliminating criminal groups in which they were involved?

During the years of stagnation, hundreds of thousands of people were drawn into illegal operations, into the circular chain of bribery and corruption. Many of them dream today of washing themselves clean of the disgrace, of confessing, making restitution for damages, and assisting in the investigation. But the fear of criminal accountability shared by all holds them back. The practice in use over many years by foreign investigative services shows that the greatest success in fighting the mafia is achieved in those places where a law on the chief witness is in effect.

In short, the questions are many. It is important to understand that imperfections in our laws have a significant influence on the effectiveness of the fight against organized crime.

[KOMMUNIST] In this regard, how do you relate to increasing demands in our society to resort to extreme measures in fighting the mafia, to dreams of "the iron fist"?

[Badamyants] As a professional employee of the organs of state security, I cannot help but be alarmed by the readiness of the population, disturbed by the growth of crime, to sacrifice a portion of their civil rights and freedoms for the sake of bringing order to the country. But hasn't the history of our country confirmed the age-old truth that even a noble end never justifies dubious means? In planning measures to fight organized crime, therefore, we must reject the concept of the "iron fist." We are obliged to present people with a hard and steadfast law and to require that this law be respected by one and all. These days we have seen a sharp outburst of violence involving the use of weapons. And everyone knows that this violence can be stopped only by force—sermons will not be of assistance here. At the same time, the chief tool, the main instrument in the struggle should consist of political methods, and they should be utilized by the appropriate social organizations. In this regard I cannot help but recall something similar in our past history, when law enforcement organs—state security organs in particular—moved ahead of the political struggle, and you well know what this led to.

[KOMMUNIST] And if we move from theory to practice in KGB operations?

[Badamyants] It should be stated that state security organs waged a constant struggle against corruption and the mafia even prior to the resolution mentioned earlier. It is sufficient to recall the so-called "cotton affair" among others. In our republic, for example, the criminal activity of a group of individuals engaged in swindling, currency speculation, and arrangement of bribes for trips abroad, was cut short. More than 300 people in all were involved in the criminal activity.

Later on, the organizers and executors of the brutal murders of two former employees of law enforcement organs, Kurginyan and Torosyan, were identified and brought to criminal justice. And quite recently we apprehended an inveterate repeat offender listed with the All-Union Criminal Investigations Department, who was then sent to Volgograd where proceedings were instituted against him with regard to several articles of the criminal code. A number of racketeers and extortionists were put out of commission, the facts of which were reported in the press and on television. These are only a few examples. We also have some more significant cases on our hands—but I would say this is an area in which glasnost might bring harm.

[KOMMUNIST] Valeriy Georgiyevich, you have already discoursed in the republic press on the work of the Armenian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] KGB in rehabilitating people subjected to repression through no fault of their own. What can you add to this?

[Badamyants] Recently I was briefed on materials concerning reexamination of the case in the archives against the prominent Armenian poet Yegishe Charents. Here is the picture that emerged...

He was accused in 1933-1936 of creating and heading a Trotskyite-nationalist organization allegedly operating in Yerevan. Amazingly, however, he remained free another eight months. His first interrogation was conducted 16 November 1936. Charents did not plead guilty. He stated he was just the organizer and leader of the "Noyember" writers' union, to which the group of prominent Armenian writers closest to him belonged—people such as Aksel Bakunts, Mkrtych Armen Arutyunyan, and Gurgen Maari. Charents especially stressed during his interrogation that his group had not engaged in any counterrevolutionary activity.

On 29 November 1936 another accusation was leveled against Charents. He was accused of allegedly engaging in propaganda to incite ethnic strife. Finally, on 27 July

1937, on order of the People's Commissariat of Internal Affairs of Armenia, Mugdusi Charents was arrested. We have been unable to find documents of his interrogations after his arrest. The criminal case against Mugdusi, who was later executed as an enemy of the people, would probably be able to shed some light on this tragedy. At least we have not abandoned hope in this area.

The military procuracy, conducting a review of the case 35 years ago, managed to find documentation of legal-medical experts Krivizhinskiy and Ovsepyan dated 28 November 1937 on the autopsy on Charents's body and findings as to the cause of death. Unfortunately, the date was not indicated. The findings note that Charents suffered from a number of serious chronic illnesses which, in their totality, resulted in general dystrophy and death.

This is all we have been able to uncover thus far in the archives. Materials are scarce, unfortunately, and the people who would be able to reconstruct the truth are dying off. But even in 1955 it was recognized that Charents was an outstanding Armenian poet who sang the praises of the Soviet state system and whose works had great ideological and artistic value. On 25 May 1955 the Military Procuracy closed its case against Charents, removing any accusation for lack of criminal substance in his activities. Incidentally, the Armenian Writers' Union was informed of this.

On the whole, our efforts to review cases involving decisions of nonjudicial organs (the so-called "troikas" and "special boards") have been completed. About 3,000 cases were reviewed, from which more than 4,000 individuals were rehabilitated.

We attach great significance to the problem of restoring their good names to those subjected to unjustified repression. In particular, we are delivering certain materials to party organs to settle the question of their reinstatement in the party. All personal items retained in the archives of the Armenian branch of the Marxism-Leninism Institute of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee and all documents concerning prominent political figures in the Armenian Communist Party who were subjected to repression during those years have been handed over. Our employees continue their search to establish the locations of mass burial of repressed individuals. In my view, a fitting conclusion to this effort would be the immortalization of their memory by the erection of memorials. But this is really more the prerogative of our community.

I received a letter not long ago from a Yerevan resident, V.S. Frangulyan, telling of four of his relatives who were wrongfully repressed. He had warm words of gratitude for our personnel who had restored justice, dignity, and honor to people slandered some time ago. Words of gratitude were also addressed to Chekists by Megri resident S.M. Martirosyan, a teacher, who was a young boy when his father became a victim of repression. These and many other letters which arrive at the state security organs convince me even more strongly that this work is extremely important, and not only in cleansing history of its blank, or more accurately its black, spots. It is no less important to directly engage the new generation of Chekists in this process, people who were not involved in the tragic period, and enable them to personally experience the pain of loss and evil deeds the people have had to bear, and which the state security organs themselves have had to bear as well. They should relive the pain politically and emotionally so that they never permit anything similar to take place in the future in their own conduct of official operations.

Naturally not all of us were participants in those terrible mistakes and serious crimes that were committed. But it is our history, yours and mine, and we will not escape from it. It belongs to all of us and we have to proceed from it.

[KOMMUNIST] Regarding the draft platform of the party Central Committee which was approved at the February Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, many diametrically opposed views are being expressed concerning Article 6 of the USSR Constitution, a multiparty system, and so forth. What is your position on this issue?

[Badamyants] I am headed for Moscow to participate in the work of the Third Congress of People's Deputies, and I can tell you with assurance that in the event this issue is discussed, I personally will vote for the removal of Article 6 from the basic law of the country. I believe that, at least in the form in which it presently appears, we cannot retain this article. The presence of Article 6 has pampered the party and freed it from the necessity to wage political struggle. It has rescued it and, as we have today become convinced, has done so in vain. At the same time, I am convinced that the CPSU is a most important political organization and it should occupy a leading role—but only using political means, using political struggle.

With respect to a multiparty system, I can only say that we must deal with realities. And what are these today? The multiparty phenomenon is becoming reality.

But I would like to stress in addition to all this that, as a communist, I am convinced that Marxist-Leninist doctrine will carve its own way. It will be victorious and prevail. However, this doctrine must not carve its way with directives and an appropriate article in the Constitution, but rather through propaganda, by convincing people, and—most importantly—by its deeds, which must be based on principles of humanism and democracy. The individual must be at the center of party policy.

I don't think of myself outside the party, but I support a renewed party, an innovative party that would fully express the interests of all our peoples. The party must establish good, sound, businesslike relations with many social organizations.

To achieve these aims we must be guided by Marxist-Leninist theory, while at the same time not repudiating everything in sight. Fencing off our society from other philosophical outlooks, we have until recently merely impoverished ourselves, denied ourselves many human and social entities of value. And it is precisely such an impoverished society that makes it easy for various kinds of totalitarian, antipopular, and antihumane regimes to emerge. For if we return to the question of repression or, let us say, of collectivization, which was a terrible violation of everything conceivable and inconceivable, it is felt that the fact of our state being at a very low level of general development provided a good foundation for this horrible tragedy. And so we find ourselves today in such a situation, even flirting with capitalism to some extent.

[KOMMUNIST] Since you brought up the question, we might like to know what changes you see in ties between the motherland and the Armenian community and its political parties living abroad.

[Badamyants] Well, let me say first of all that here I am not talking about "flirting." Here we are dealing with a desire to enrich ourselves on the social, cultural, human, and humane levels.

Broad dialogue with various foreign organizations and parties of our community abroad only became possible, understandably, with the onset of perestroyka, the democratization of our society, and the restoration of historical justice. Ties between the motherland and the numerous Armenian communities abroad are being established in some places and are growing and expanding in others.

From the moment Soviet rule was established in Armenia, the republic has supported traditionally friendly relations with the parties "Gnchak" and "Ramkavar." With respect to "Dashnaktsutyun," its political platform and anti-Soviet activity during the Great Patriotic War prevented any kind of earlier relations. But here, too, a great deal has been altered by our reinvigoration processes and the natural gravitation of Dashnaks to their historical native land.

Judge for yourself. The 24th Dashnaktsutyun Congress, conducted in August 1988, decided for the first time to declare in its political platform unconditional support for perestroyka in the USSR. And it repudiated the conduct of any kind of negative activity against the Soviet Union, or the Armenian SSR as an integral part of it. Dashnaks openly declared their categorical disagreement with any actions directed towards Armenian secession from the USSR, understanding the catastrophic and fatal consequences of such a step. The Dashnaktsutyun bureau came out against the activity of various social organizations and groups in the republic which are damaging the friendship of the Armenian and Russian peoples and their historic ties. The Dashnaks have also taken a reasonable and balanced position regarding the problem of interethnic conflict flaring up in the Transcaucasus, the reality we must deal with. Dialogue became possible and we were grateful in accepting the great assistance provided by the Dashnaks in the recovery effort in regions devastated by earthquake.

Today we speak about the priority of common human values. I am personally convinced that it was not just immoral to fence ourselves off from our countrymen abroad with the "iron curtain"—it was simply stupid as well. We do not harbor any fanatical bitterness with respect to any political or social organization of the Armenian community abroad. Everything depends on a proper understanding of today's realities and a desire to carry on a frank and honest dialogue with us.

[KOMMUNIST] Thank you, Valeriy Georgiyevich, for our conversation. We hope we can continue it in the future, now that we have glasnost.

[Badamyants] I agree. There are no questions to which we would be unable to give clear and precise answers.

**From the Armenian Press Agency.** At the authors' request, honoraria for publication have been transferred to the fund to aid Armenian refugees.

## Armenians Discuss Economic Autonomy Plan

*PM2303095390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 22 Mar 90 Morning Edition p 6*

[Report by IZVESTIYA correspondent Sergey Bablumyan under the rubric "Direct Line. IZVESTIYA Own Correspondents at the Teleprinter": "Principles of Economic Autonomy""]

[Text] Yerevan—The draft concept for Armenian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] economic autonomy has been submitted for nationwide discussion.

What does economic autonomy mean? From the draft it follows that it involves, in particular, the republic's right to settle on its own all questions relating to the strategy and tactics of socioeconomic development, the management and regulation of the economic system, and the establishment of economic ties with partners outside Armenia. It is stipulated that those questions which the republic itself voluntarily transfers to USSR jurisdiction are excluded from those designated in the draft. It is appropriate here to stress once again that Armenian SSR economic independence is being formulated so as not to infringe the rights and interests of other republics and regions of the country or of foreign states.

All types of ownership—by the republic, local soviets, public organizations, cooperatives, joint-stock companies, and private, individual, and mixed—are deemed equal, are regulated by republic legislation, and are safeguarded by the state. As for the subjects of ownership, apart from the republic's Supreme Soviet, local soviets, collectives, and citizens these can be union bodies, union republics, and also foreign states, their firms, and organizations. The latter is of particular

interest owing to the prospect of setting up a free enterprise zone in Armenia.

The draft provides for other radical transformations in the republic's socioeconomic life and the mechanism of economic relations. The law prepared from the draft and other normative acts will be submitted to the Armenian Supreme Soviet for ratification.

### Armenian Party Commission Debates Draft Platform

*NC2903103590 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 1630 GMT 28 Mar 90*

[Text] The Armenian Communist Party Central Committee's Party Building and Cadre Policy Commission met on 27 March and discussed the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee's draft platform for the 29th Congress of the Armenian Communist Party. It specifically discussed those elements of the draft platform that refer to restructuring and renewal of the republican party organization, its participation in Armenia's social and political life, and various other aspects of the party life.

Secretaries of the party organizations in the major production enterprises, organizations, scientific institutions, and educational establishments participated in forming the draft platform. Muradkhanyan, deputy chief of the Party Building and Cadre Work Department of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee, briefed the meeting.

The draft platform is an important document that will serve as a basis for the Armenian Communist Party's future activity. Therefore, it was noted at the meeting, the draft platform must be well assessed by considering all political, social, and economic factors in the republic and in the country. The meeting's participants stressed that the draft platform must more comprehensively reflect the numerous and complex problems facing the republic's communists and workers today. Among these problems are the Communist Party's place in society, democratization and openness in party life, consolidating the party's ties with the people, enhancing the autonomy of the Armenian Communist Party within the framework of the CPSU, interethnic relations, and the vital need to politically resolve the most difficult problems of the times.

The commission, in referring to the principles of mutual relations with the trade unions, Komsomols [Leninist Communist Youth Leagues], and other public organizations, underlined that those relations must be characterized by cooperation and by civilized and involved political debate and dialogue. The party line must be implemented through the communists working in these organizations.

Other opinions were also exchanged. Oleg Lobov, chairman of the commission on the draft platform and second secretary of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee, summed up the results of the meeting.

### Razumovskiy Leaves Yerevan 6 Apr

*NC0704094890 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 0500 GMT 7 Apr 90*

[From the review of KHORHRDAYIN HAYASTAN]

[Text] Razumovskiy, CPSU Central Committee candidate member and CPSU Central Committee secretary, who had come to our republic, left Yerevan yesterday. Comrades Movsisyan, Voskanyan, Markaryants, members and candidate members of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau, and representatives of the people saw him off at Zvartnots Airport. The newspaper carries an ARMENPRES report on this on its first page.

### Armenian Foreign Minister Interviewed

*PM0904081090 Amsterdam DE VOLKSKRANT in Dutch 29 Mar 90 p 4*

[Report on interview in The Hague with Armenian Foreign Minister Anatoliy Mkrtchyan by Anet Bleich and Joris Versteeg: date of interview not given: "'If Moscow Supports Us, They Will Have One Less Problem'"]

[Text] The Hague—The reaction of Armenian Foreign Minister Anatoliy Mkrtchyan to the conflict between the Soviet Union and Lithuania can only be described as phlegmatic, in view of the great tensions involved. "I am an optimist," he told us during an interview at the Nieuwspoort International Press Center. "In the end what the people want will happen."

"Just as it will with us, in Nagorno-Karabakh," Mkrtchyan added, making a direct reference to the disputed Armenian enclave in Azerbaijan whose inhabitants want to establish firm ties with Armenia. His stance in favor of the Lithuanian right to self-determination does not mean that Mkrtchyan is happy with the Lithuanians' strategy. "Things should be approached rationally. You can't say: Yesterday we were still part of the Soviet Union, and today we are not."

The Armenian minister is an favor of a referendum. Such a weighty decision as a declaration of independence cannot be taken by a parliament alone. "If you think that the Netherlands should merge with the rest of Benelux, it is not sufficient for the Second Chamber alone to voice its views on the matter."

In the short term Mkrtchyan is hoping for a cooling-off period. "In a situation as heated as it is at present it is not possible to make rational decisions. What will happen when one side says: 'We want nothing more to do with the Soviet Union,' and the other replies: 'Nonsense, you are still a part of it'"?

The Armenian recommends a pause for thought which can be used to prepare for negotiations. Mkrtchyan gave the balance of power in Europe as the reason for this very moderate approach compared with other non-Russian republics. "If the Soviet Union subsides into chaos and disintegrates, what will be the result? The result will be that Germany will remain as the only great power in Europe."

Anatoliy Mkrtchyan is in The Hague as part of a promotion campaign for Europolis. The plan is to build a city largely financed by the international community (governments, businessmen, private individuals) at the foot of Mount Ararat. This small town, to be built according to the most modern architectural principles, could provide a solution to some of Armenia's homelessness problems. Almost 800,000 Armenians have no homes anymore, as a result of the major earthquake and the stream of refugees from Azerbaijan.

The Armenians are a traumatized people. The recent pogroms—in February 1988 in Sumgait and at the beginning of this year in Baku—come on top of the still-fresh memories of the genocide in 1915, when the Turks killed a million Armenians living among them.

However, enthusiasm for the national cause has not flagged. The Karabakh Committee has transformed itself into an Armenian National Movement, which according to not-always-reliable opinion polls will gain 50 percent of the votes in the 20 May elections. The movement is striving for democratization, and in the long term wants an independent position for Armenia.

Minister Mkrtchyan finds this last idea less than appealing. According to Mkrtchyan, the desire for an independent Armenia is only to be found among a minority. The reason for this is as prosaic as it is urgent: physical security. "Look at our geographical position." The tiny republic (3 million inhabitants) has as its neighbors Turkey, Azerbaijan, and Iran—none of them good friends of the Armenians—as well as Georgia and Russia.

"Stay together with Russia for security's sake? Of course! I do not want to seem cynical, but it is an argument. Even the Armenians of the diaspora—and one-third of our people live in the United States, the Middle East, or elsewhere—say that separatism would not be a good choice for Armenia."

The government and the Armenian National Movement are agreed in their wishes for the future of Nagorno-Karabakh. The autonomous region (170,000 inhabitants, of whom 80 percent are Armenians), which at the moment is under the direct control of the Soviet Army, should be removed from the control of the Azerbaijani authorities. An idea that springs to mind is direct presidential rule. In the meantime a political solution could be found through negotiation, which must then be confirmed in a referendum: Why not?

"The population of Nagorno-Karabakh," Minister Mkrtchyan said resolutely, "know what they want, and will not allow themselves to be forced in any other direction. They want the right to speak their own language, they want to be able to go to Armenian schools, watch Armenian television, and listen to Armenian music. You could reply that something like that would also be possible in the union with Azerbaijan. Theoretically that is very nice, but after the pogroms in Sumgait and Baku it has become unthinkable."

How great is Armenian confidence in Moscow, which has been able to offer the Armenians little concrete protection, and which under Azerbaijani pressure last fall even suspended the interim regime of direct rule? For a Soviet politician, Mkrtchyan was pretty frank.

"In the Soviet Union we had gotten used to saying to each other that we did not have any nationalities problems. We convinced ourselves that we were the happiest country in the world. When we were confronted with the real problems, we stood there helpless."

He does not want to describe this as disappointment with Moscow's approach. "There is no real Moscow approach. Its approach has always been a zigzag course." What he does accuse the Soviet Government of is of pursuing an ostrich policy. "The people in the Kremlin were forever saying to us: 'This is not the right time for a discussion of Armenia and Karabakh. We are in the midst of perestroyka, we have economic problems. When we have solved these, we will immediately start talking about what you want.' But that was wrong; it led to an explosive situation. Economic and national problems are related. The difference between them and us is as follows: They say, 'We have 18 problems.' And we say, 'If you solve our problem now, there will only be 17 left. That is one less at least."

## New People's Association Formed in Azerbaijan

*LD1404155490 Moscow World Service in Russian 0930 GMT 14 Apr 90*

[From the "Soviet Chronicle" feature of the "Soviet Union Day by Day" program]

[Text] A new public organization, the Azerbaijan People's Association [Azerbaydzhanskoye Narodnoye Obyedineniye—ANO] has been set up in Azerbaijan. There are now more than 30 such organizations in the republic.

The aim of the ANO, said Mamed Kuliyev, one of its leaders, in an INTERFAX interview, is to insure the sovereignty, territorial integrity, and economic independence of Azerbaijan and the development of democratic socialism. Mamed Kuliyev condemned the Armenian extremists encroaching on Azerbaijan territory and said that the ANO is opposed to all actions directed at splitting the friendship between peoples.

## Georgian Komsomol Reportedly To Be Disbanded

*PM2803133590 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 27 Mar 90 p4*

[Report by KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA special correspondents N. Mikeladze, A. Mursaliyev: "Last Congress?"]

[Text] Tbilisi—Last time, the Georgian Komsomol [Lenin Communist Youth League] was told that the republic Komsomol must announce its disbandment at its forthcoming congress. That was on 15 March, at a conference of the Georgian sociopolitical national movement. We will be frank, this strong warning will force all kinds of people in modern-day Georgia to stop and think. Particularly the Georgian Komsomol.

Incidentally, previously such "wishes" addressed to informal associations would have prompted a storm of indignation, as this was considered to be an encroachment on democracy. But what about now?

We will immediately point out that the congress has been held and the Komsomol is still a real character on the stage of public life at present. Although there is no longer a party for it in the hubbub of Georgian political voices.

The organization settled its scores to the accompaniment of discordant whistles and hooting: Young people who had taken the risk of gambling on the Komsomol, unlike their predecessors, were given a rough ride. "Yesterday saw the last (please God) congress of the Georgian Komsomol." These are the words with which the commercial youth paper SHANS—also an offshoot of the Komsomol, incidentally—opened its issue. Even the Komsomol's own press organ, the newspaper AKHALGAZRDA KOMUNISTI (MOLODOY KOMMUNIST), has hastened to hammer its nail into the coffin.... On the day of the congress, the newspaper changed "firms." Henceforth it will be called AKHALGAZRDA IVERIELI (MOLODOY IVER). Jumping ahead a little, we will say that the congress approved the newspaper's new title.

It was amid attitudes like these that the congress began work. In a sad, penitential tone, it gave an account of the organization's almost 70-year history, the logical conclusion of which—if the main report was anything to go by—is the collapse of that organization. Some radiant faces tried to convince us that for many Komsomol functionaries the future of their organization is not such a sad event. In fact, some even asked: "What kind of organization are we talking about?! A Georgian Komsomol with 640,000 members is a myth, no doubt about it." Levan Chikvaidze, first secretary of the Mtatsmindskiy (formerly Kalininskiy) Raykom [Rayon Committee], quoted some figures: At the beginning of last year the raykom had 11,000 members on its books. This year it has 6,000. Moreover, only 2,000 actually pay their fees, and it seems that this is done by automatic transfer.

Even the speech by G. Gumbaridze, chairman of the Georgian Supreme Soviet Presidium and first secretary of the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee, did not really come across as an argument from the senior party comrade: It was more like an appeal by the head of the republic to young people.

The emotion and agitation affected the delegates.

"This is my tenth congress," you could hear dismay in the voice of Mziya Chanturiya, director of the History of the Georgian Komsomol Museum, "but never have I felt so upset. Everything that we have achieved during these years has been wiped out.... It pains me. Our name is being besmirched and we are unable to defend ourselves.... But I feel that my generation has done nothing bad. I could understand it if there were corrupt people, careerists among us.... But we have always criticized such people and continue to do so now. We have made our share of mistakes, but everyone makes mistakes. The opposition is not insured against making mistakes itself. They must exist and we must exist.... History will be the judge...."

But it transpired that the Komsomol does have its defenders. True, as it became clear during the discussions, they have not risen to its defense because of an idea. We do, of course, understand everything that is happening with the Komsomol and the party, representatives of the Abkhazian and South Osetian delegations said, but the situation is such that, if the republic organization were to disband, some of our young people would not abide by the congress decisions.

The danger of a split along national lines was obvious to many. They spoke about this frankly. For example, I. Dzhioyev, first secretary of the South Osetian Obkom [Oblast Committee], said in a television interview that he intends to save the republic organization.

There are some people who believe that there cannot be any danger of the Georgian Komsomol splitting along national lines. In the opinion of L. Kikaleishvili, chairman of the "Mamuli" ("Otchizna") Youth Organization, the idea of a national Komsomol is nonsense. The Komsomol is founded on cosmopolitanism, he said. The preservation of the Komsomol can be a subject for discussion but not the creation of national organizations.

We may speak in different languages, but the crux of the matter we are discussing does not change because of this, Voland pointed out. And the crux is that it is not so much and not only interethnic contradictions that have come to light in the process of dissolution but an incredibly large number of philosophical, property, economic, legal, and bureaucratic contradictions. It seems that contradictions are all that is left.

More and more people said: "Let us postpone the decision." Then a delegate from Kutaisi rose to his feet. He uttered the word which is to the liking of many: "self-determination." Of course, he said, the Komsomol must not exist in its present form. However, the congress

is not empowered to decide the question of disbandment. Every Komsomol member must be given time and opportunity to make his views known.

We did not see the official close of the congress. An unexpected report arrived just in time: Informal associations had taken over the building of the Georgian Komsomol Central Committee. The presidium and a few delegates urgently went to the scene of the incident.

The well-appointed building on Machabeli Street, well known to the people of Tbilisi not only as the headquarters of the Georgian Komsomol but also as the former residence of L.P. Beriya, appeared perfectly normal. However, the people inside the building were strangers. Some 30-40 young men and women had gathered in the small auditorium on the third floor.

Some of them came and sat down near us and explained that they had come here with the intention of putting pressure on the Komsomol nomenklatura.

"We had heard that the Komsomol was disbanding," others said to us, "so we came here to take a look at the premises with a view to using them for our own organizations. But if the Komsomol remains we will leave. Because we do not want to live in the same building as the Komsomol, which is essentially an amoral organization. But when it does leave we will be glad to have a few rooms here."

We will leave these words on the conscience of those who spoke them....

The informal associations left the building about an hour later. Although some stayed behind for talks with the Komsomol leadership.

Meanwhile, other events were developing in the conference hall of the youth campus. The fact is that, a month before the congress, youth newspapers published two drafts. The first was the draft Statute and Program of the renewed Komsomol, while the second was the draft of a new organization which, in principle, has nothing in common with the Komsomol. A month ago it was proposed that they be discussed at the congress. But the first option had barely been published before it was laid to rest at the Central Committee plenum.

Underlining the fundamental difference between the Free Georgian Youth League (the proposed name) and the Komsomol, the discussion of the draft was begun after the official close of the congress. Actually, it was not really a discussion: The atmosphere was too unsettled. An initiative group was elected to set up the new league. G. Dobordzhginidze, head of the Komsomol Central Committee Propaganda Department, who chaired the meeting, said that it will be an apolitical social organization, free of any ideology. It has been conceived as a movement open to a'l youth groups, parties, and associations.

On this point the debate had to come to an end. The lights went out across the youth campus. The much-depleted congress contingent moved in the direction of Machabeli Street. It was here, at this late hour, that the meeting was joined by S. Gogiberidze, first secretary of the Georgian Komsomol Central Committee, who had completed her negotiations with the informal associations by this time. She also expressed her wish to be in the initiative group.

So the 34th Georgian Komsomol Congress came to an end, having failed to give a direct answer to a single serious question and leaving two groups behind it in memory: the initiative group for setting up the new league and the coordination commission for the self-determination of the old league. They must act during the next two months: During this time all members of the Georgian Komsomol must define their attitude to the fate of the old and new leagues.

The congress has appealed to the republic Council of Ministers to find employment for Komsomol cadres who will be released from their duties after the re-registration. However, the cadres themselves have decided: Our task is not to wait for favors from the Council of Ministers.... Members of the Central Committee apparatus are in conference literally all their working hours. A great deal is still unclear: What the name of the new league will be, what the wording of various articles in the draft will be, and so forth, but at least something was briefly imparted to us by Central Committee Secretary G. Baramidze:

"We are planning to make over the Komsomol's property to the Free Georgian Youth League, as it is provisionally called. Its structure will be the same as that of the Komsomol, i.e. we would like to preserve the rayon, city, and oblast committees and, of course, the republic-level organ of administration...."

Perhaps the opposition was in too much of a hurry to view the rooms in the building on Machabeli Street? Still to take definite form, the new league is already making claim to the Komsomol legacy. True, not its ideological legacy, but its property legacy.

But the situation does appear to be coming clearer.

## Central Asia

### First Session of Kirghiz Supreme Soviet Held

#### Constitution Issues Pondered

*LD1304194190 Moscow TASS in English 1904 GMT 13 Apr 90*

[Text] Frunze April 13 TASS—The first session of the Supreme Soviet of Kirghizia is under way here.

The deputies passed the bill on changes and supplements to the Constitution (the Basic Law) of the Kirghiz SSR.

According to the law, the Communist Party of Kirghizia will participate in elaborating state policy, managing state and social affairs through their representatives elected to soviets of people's deputies, and in other democratic forms.

The Communist Party will function within the framework of the Constitution and the laws of the USSR and Kirghizia. Deputies noted that the republican Communist Party's renunciation of power monopoly creates prerequisites for a multi-party system.

The formation of the Republican Council of Ministers has been finalised at the session.

### Various Laws Adopted

*LD1404162290 Moscow TASS in English 1457 GMT 14 Apr 90*

[Text] Frunze April 14 TASS—A session of the Kirghiz Supreme Soviet ended here today.

After a thorough analysis, people's deputies adopted a number of laws: on land, property, the lease contract system and the relationship it involves, as well as on the constitutional compliance in the Republic of Kirghizia.

### Tajik Supreme Soviet Elects Officials

*LD1304151290 Dushanbe Domestic Service in Tajik 1000 GMT 13 Apr 90*

[Text] The session of the Tajik Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet continued its work today. At 1000, Comrade Makhkamov, chairman of the Tajik SSR Supreme Soviet, opened the session, which began discussions on items from the agenda by electing the first deputy chairman of the Tajik SSR Supreme Soviet. Deputy Kadruddin Aslanov was nominated for this post and was duly elected. Similarly, the session elected Comrade (Yevgenyevich Turgunov) as deputy chairman of the Tajik SSR Council of Ministers.

The deputies then began electing the chairman of the Tajik SSR Council of Ministers. Khayeyev was elected to this (?important) post. With this, the morning session of the Tajik SSR Supreme Soviet ended.

At this moment when you are hearing this news bulletin, the fourth afternoon meeting of the session has begun.

### New Uzbek Council of Ministers Listed

*LD1504165590 Tashkent PRAVDA VOSTOKA in Russian 31 Mar 90 p 1*

[Text] The Uzbek SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet has decided to approve the Uzbek SSR Council of Ministers with the following composition:

Chairman of the Uzbek SSR Council of Ministers, Mirsaidov Shukurulla Rakhmatovich; First Deputy Chairman of the Uzbek SSR Council of Ministers, Berkov Dmitriy Dmitriyevich; First Deputy of the Uzbek SSR Council of Ministers, Dzhurabekov Ismail Khakimovich; Deputy Chairman of the Uzbek SSR Council of Ministers for Emergencies, Aripdzhanov Makhmut Maripovich; Deputy Chairmen of the Uzbek SSR Council of Ministers, Ismailov Uktam Kuchkarovich, Umarbekov Ul'mas Rakhimbekovich, Sharipov Takhir Yakhyaevich; Minister of Finance, Mamatisayev Igit Isayevich; Minister of the Construction Materials Industry, Iskandarov Inom Nazarovich; Minister of Grain Products, Mutalov Abdulkhashim; Minister of Light Industry, Ikramov Anvar Salikhovich; Minister of Internal Affairs, Kamalov Vyacheslav Mukhtarovich; Minister of Land Reclamation and Water Resources, Giniyatullin Rim Abdulovich; Minister of Installation and Special Construction Work, Nugmanov Pulat; Minister of Higher and Secondary Specialized Education, Alimov Shavkat Arifdzhanovich; Minister of Communications, Rakhimov Kamildzhan; Minister of Trade, Usmanov Mirabror Zufarovich; Minister of Health, Bakhramov Saidzhalal Makhmudovich; Minister of Foreign Affairs, Azuimov Sarvar Alimdzhanovich; Minister of Construction, Makhamadaliyev Kudratilla Khikmatullayevich; Minister of People's Education, Yusupov Kamil'; Minister of Highways, Yunusov Rustam Rasulovich; Minister of Motor Transport, Akhmetov Lerik; Minister of Local Industry, Chzhen Viktor Anatol'yevich; Minister of Social Security, Khodzhayeva Sanobar Akhralovna; Minister of Housing and Municipal Services, Mikhailov Viktor Konstantinovich; Chairmen Uzbek SSR State Committee For Material and Technical Supply, Sharipov Takhir Yakhyaevich; For the Press, Abdurazzakov Ubaidulla Abbasovich; For Labor and Social Issues, Gulyamov Khamidulla Khabibullayevich; On Prices Akhmedov Kudratilla Akhmedovich; For the Supply of Petroleum Products, Muminov Yakub Turgunovich; For Supervision of Safe Working Practices in Industry and Mine Supervision, Akhmedbayev Arkram Gulyamovich; On Statistics, Khazhimuratov Shukhrat; For Water Resources, Baimirov Tukhtamish Baimirovich; Construction For Environmental Protection, Alimov Timur Agzamovich; For Television and Radio Broadcasting, Gaibov Naim Yavkachevich; For Physical Culture and Nazirov Abid Sports Chairman of the State Security Committee, Morgasov Anatoliy Sergeyevich; Chairman of the Uzbek SSR State Cooperative Committee for Agriculture, Karimov Rustam Ibragimovich; Chairman of the Uzbek SSR State Committee for Construction Affairs, Temkin Yevgeniy Sergeyevich; Chief of the Uzbek SSR Main Directorate for Construction in Tashkent City, Uzbek SSR Minister, Tulyaganov Kozim Nasyrovich

In accordance with Article 120 of the Uzbek SSR Constitution, the chairman of the Karakalpak ASSR [Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic] Council of Ministers in included in the Uzbek SSR Council of Ministers.

[Signed] M. Ibragimov, chairman of the Uzbek SSR Supreme Soviet

[Dated] Tashkent City, 30 March 1990

**Uzbek Supreme Soviet Commission Chairmen Listed**
*LD1504202990*

[Editorial Report] Tashkent PRAVDA VOSTOKA in Rusian on 1 April on pages 2 and 3 carries a decision of the Uzbek Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR], Supreme Soviet on the Standing Commissions of the Uzbek SSR Supreme Soviet. The names of the Commissions and their chairmen are as follows.

Credentials Commission, Mirziyayev Shavkat Miramanovich; Commission on Planning and Budget and Finance, Bakibayev Erkin Zhurayevich; Commission on Econmic Reform and Local Self-Government, Yuldashev Abduvakhob Abdusamatovich; Commission on International Affairs, Khabibullayev Pulat; Commission on Issues of Legislation, Legality and Law and Order, Khalilov Erkin Khamdamovich; Commission on Industry, Consumer Goods, Services to the Population and Trade, Khaidarov Toichi; Commission on Transportation, Roads, Communications, and Information Technology, Zakhritdinov Gulyam Zakhritdinovich; Commission on Agrarian Issues and Water Resources, Tashkenbayev Alisher Kholmuradovich; Commission on Issues of Interethnic Relations, Language, and International Education, Kadyrov Primkul Kadirovich; Commission on Culture, Science, People's Education and the Protection of the Cultural Heritage, Askarov Akhmadali; Commission on Construction Architecture, Housing, and Municipal Services and Utilities, Khabibullayev Askhad Sharipovich; Commission on Issues of Ecology and the Rational Use of Natural Resources, Dzhalilov Abdulakhat Turapovich; Commission on Health Care, Affairs of Women, Motherhood and Children, Usmanova Khalima Melikuziyevna; Commission on Affairs of Veterans and Invalids, Abdullayev Rakhmatulla Khamidullayevich; Commission on Youth Affairs, Agzamkhodzhayev Alisher Anvarovich; Commission on Issues of Glasnost, Vakhidov Erkin